

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petitions of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Union Avenue Baptist Church, Methodist Episcopal Church of Paterson, and Passaic Baptist Church, of Passaic, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of First Baptist Church of West-bergen, Waverly Congregational Church and Sunday School, and Leonard W. Borst, of Jersey City, and Woodcliff Reformed Church, of North Bergen, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of Rev. John Hammond, of Scranton, and E. T. Dimmick, of Carbondale, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Riley Pond, John W. Wire, William Mann, J. W. Brindle, James Williams, William Cleverger, Ralph Miller, and C. Rhonemus, of Wilmington, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 11970, to pension the "squirrel hunters"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of St. John's Baptist Church, of Springfield, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of A. B. Arnold; Coventry Central Baptist Church, of Anthony, R. I.; First Methodist Church, of Centerville, R. I.; Wood River Church, of Richmond, R. I.; Samuel M. Cathcart, of Westerly, R. I.; Meshanticut Baptist Sunday School, of Cranston, R. I.; Curtis Corner Sunday School, of Gould, R. I.; North Scituate A. C. Church, of North Scituate, R. I.; Methodist Episcopal Church, of East Greenwich, R. I.; Miss Mary B. Pittlefield, Harry E. Fennants, Natick Baptist Church, Margaret Main, James W. Main, F. J. Earl Dodsworth, Clarence C. Maine, Isabelle Potter, and B. Pierce Tabor, of Natick, R. I.; Second Baptist Church, of Shannock, R. I.; Rev. Frank Gardner, of Phenix, R. I.; Everett E. Jones; Brotherhood of Wakefield Baptist Church, of Wakefield, R. I.; and Rev. F. D. Smock, of Foster Center, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Ladies' Bible Class and Mena Bible Class, of Hope, R. I.; Hartford P. Brown Bible Class, First Baptist Church, of Hope Valley, R. I.; Primitive Methodist Church of Pascoag, R. I.; Swedish Baptist Church, of Hills Grove, R. I.; Park Place Congregational Church, of Pawtucket, R. I.; Herbert Hannah, of Arlington, R. I.; Samuel Albro, of Washington, R. I.; Wickford Baraca Bible Class, of Wickford, R. I.; Trinity Union Methodist Episcopal Church, Allied Temperance Committee of Rhode Island, Elmwood Christian Church, George W. Petri, Trinity Baptist Church, William T. Greene, John Harrop, Rev. James E. Springer, Corliss Heights Baptist Sunday School, and Charles W. Littlefield, Esq., of Providence, R. I.; and Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of East Greenwich, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of members of the Methodist Church of Rockland, members of the Epworth League of Stoughton, Methodist Episcopal Church of Whitman, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Boston (Mass.) Socialist Club, protesting against sending foodstuffs to nations at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Gen. James C. Strong, of Oakland, Cal., favoring passage of House Bill 16626, relative to retirement of Brig. Gen. James Clark Strong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Thomas B. O'Keefe, of Watsonville, and C. A. Engelhardt, of Santa Barbara, Cal., protesting against the circulation of the Menace through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Santa Cruz (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of House joint resolution 372, relative to the preparedness of the United States for war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Mound City Council, No. 207, United Commercial Travelers of America, St. Louis, Mo., favoring House bill 18683; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolutions from Allied Temperance Committee of Rhode Island; Elmwood Christian Church, Providence; Sunday school of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Mapleville; Free Baptist Church, Greenville; Rev. J. H. Roberts, Greenville; E. R. Bullock, Providence; Swedish Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence; Lime Rock Baptist Church, Lincoln; First Baptist Church, Lincoln; and Trinity Union Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of Church of the Brethren of Ogle County, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of citizens of Dechers, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of citizens of Benton, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Papers to accompany a bill for relief of George I. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: Papers to accompany a bill for a pension to Charles L. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: Papers to accompany bill to remove charge of desertion from the military record of James Hardin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of merchants of the twentieth congressional district of Illinois, favoring House bill 5308, taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of citizens of Waltham, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Osterville, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of sundry churches and citizens in the thirtieth New York district, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of City Council of Shawnee, Okla., favoring the passage of the Hamill civil-service pension bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of W. G. Rigg and others, of Hinton, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church of Mechanicsburg, Vanlue, and churches of Urbana, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of citizens of Uxbridge, Blackstone, and Lodge No. 1, International Order of Good Templars, of Worcester, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 17, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we worship Thee. Thou art worthy to receive the adoration and praise of all men. When we live upon the low plane of life Thou dost seem afar off. When we behold Thy glory through the atmosphere of our own sinful hearts our vision fades into the light of common day. Give us a perception of Thy goodness and of Thy greatness that will appeal to every high motive and purpose of our lives, remembering that our lives lived in conformity to Thy will will reach the highest possible destiny. Every motive that Thou dost appeal to is an appeal to the strength and nobility of our own manhood. Guide us this day according to Thy will. For Christ's sake, Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 94) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5849. An act to amend section 100 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911;

H. R. 12750. An act relating to procedure in United States courts; and

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

NATION-WIDE PROHIBITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that to-morrow, following the speech of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones], I shall address the Senate on the subject of nation-wide prohibition.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to exclude anti-Catholic publications from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Synod of Minnesota, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, in session at Duluth, Minn., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present two telegrams which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the following telegrams.

The Secretary read as follows:

GREENVILLE, TEX., December 15, 1914.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the ministers of Greenville, heartily commend you for your stand on prohibition during last spring and summer. About 4,000 people in Hunt County indorsed the Sheppard-Hobson resolution. The sentiment is even stronger for it now.

E. W. ALDERSON.
GRAHAM McMURRAY.
A. A. DUNCAN.
W. J. HUMPHREYS.
C. C. YOUNG.
T. FERRIN.

WHEATLAND, WYO., December 15, 1914.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Wyoming State Grange, representing 21 subordinate and 2 Pomona granges, with 495 members, in annual session assembled here, unanimously adopted resolution favoring national constitutional prohibition, and most heartily thanking you for your joint resolution pending in Congress.

P. A. SHOPE,
Business Agent Wyoming State Grange.

Mr. JONES. I have a telegram signed by George W. Slyter and H. E. Warren, of Tacoma, Wash., stating that 280 voters of the Epworth Methodist Episcopal Church of that city have unanimously indorsed the Sheppard-Hobson prohibition resolution.

I also present a petition of Laurel Lodge, No. 99, International Order of Good Templars, of Everett, Wash., asking for the passage of the prohibition resolution. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I also present a petition from the Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church of Omak, Wash., favoring the settlement of the present European war by arbitration and the establishment of an international tribunal. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Church of Olathe; members of the United Brethren Sunday School of Russell; of the Men's Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lincoln; of members of the Abbyville Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Abbyville; of the Young Men's Class of the Congregational Church of Ellis; of members of the First Methodist Sunday School of Winfield; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Redfield; and of sundry citizens of Netawaka and Redfield, all in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 6777) for the relief of Frank Ferrin, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Memphis, Wales, and St. Clair, all in the State of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, Cal., praying for the creation of a national marketing commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pacific Grove and Monterey, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a volunteer officers' retired list, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of Local Branch No. 27, Catholic Benevolent Association, and of Local Division No. 4, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Lockport, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Long Lake, N. Y., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Madison; of Arcana Lodge, No. 1, International Order of Good Templars, of Portland; and

of the Grand Lodge of Maine, International Order of Good Templars, of Waterville, all in the State of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Marion, Dunkirk, and Greentown, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the Dearborn County Council, Knights of Columbus, of Lawrenceburg, and of sundry citizens of Michigan City and Terre Haute, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the use of the mails in the transmission of anti-Catholic publications, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

SALE AND SHIPMENT OF COTTON.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, under the head of petitions and memorials I send to the desk some correspondence, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Commerce. The first letter that I shall ask the Secretary to read contains a series of questions with reference to cotton-trade conditions in Europe, which were contained in a number of letters addressed early in September to various cotton buyers, manufacturers, and dealers in Austria, Hungary, Germany, Belgium, Holland, France, Russia, and England. Thus far I have heard from correspondents in Russia and Germany, and I ask the Secretary to read the letter I sent to them and the replies, and then that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce for its further consideration. It is along the line of the communication which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] had read yesterday.

There being no objection, the letters were read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

GENTLEMEN: Will you be kind enough to answer the following questions:

First. What, in your opinion, will be the decrease and consumption of American cotton in your country on account of conditions incident to the European war?

Second. What stocks of American cotton are now on hand? What other kinds of cotton now on hand; that is, in the hands of spinners?

Third. What percentage in reduction of time, if any, are the mills in your country running?

Fourth. In case of a continuance of the war, in your opinion, will conditions in cotton manufacturing in your country improve as compared with the present conditions?

Fifth. What effect has the war had in your country in obtaining funds for the purchase of cotton?

Sixth. What is the present condition and outlook for available transportation to your country of the raw product and the exportation of your manufactured cotton goods?

Seventh. What effect, if any, has the war had upon the supply of available labor in your cotton manufacturing business?

Eighth. To what extent has the supply of American cotton in your country been affected by the disturbance of transportation facilities?

Ninth. Would adequate facilities for transportation increase the consumption of American cotton in your country?

I shall be under obligations to you for as prompt reply to these inquiries as you may be able to make.

HAMBURG, October 27, 1914.

Mr. E. D. SMITH, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed letter of the 29th ultimo has been duly received, and we answer the questions submitted as follows as well as we can under the present difficult conditions:

First. In our opinion, the consumption of American cotton in Germany will entirely depend upon the quantity available. If none can be obtained, it will be almost nil after present stocks are worked up.

Second. It is impossible to say. Stocks of American cotton in spinners' hands will, in our opinion, be very small. The cost of last summer's spot cotton was very dear, and new crops were offered so much cheaper; in consequence spinners did not hold any reserve stocks.

Third. Spinners who are working for military purposes are running full time; others may, perhaps, stop three days per week or more.

Fourth. May, perhaps, improve some for certain qualities in consequence of insufficient supply.

Fifth. Owing to exporters in the United States of America asking cash payment in New York instead of drawing 60 or 90 days' sight on European bankers, funds for the purchase of cotton are very limited, but they would be plentiful could Germany obtain the cotton.

Sixth. The outlook for available transportation of cotton to Germany is very gloomy, and the same applies to the exportation of German manufactured cotton goods.

Seventh. The war has had the effect that, of course, many laborers have left the mills to go to war. However, there are enough remaining to work if the necessary cotton could be obtained.

Eighth. It has come to an almost complete standstill.

Ninth. Most certainly, could cotton be obtained from America, there would be a great increase in the consumption of American cotton in our markets.

Yours, truly,

VEREIN DER AM BAUMWOLLHANDEL
BETHEILIGTEN FIRM IN HAMBURG,
WM. FOERSTER, President.

BREMEN, November 2, 1914.

DEAR SIR: To your questions of September 29, we beg to address you with the following information:

First. Our cotton spinning and weaving mills are very busy on account of army orders. The general business of our mills is better than before the war. In the long run the consumption is hard to estimate; mills of higher goods go short time already, and many mills in the

Elsass are closed up; for the greater part of our spinners much depends on how much American cotton will reach Germany. We do not think that less than two-thirds of the general consumption will be used if this cotton can be imported.

Second. Stocks of American cotton were in Bremen at the beginning of August about 300,000 bales, and are now reduced to about 110,000 bales, which are, but for a few hundred bales, sold and pledged to spinners. Stocks in the interior are small and mostly Indian cotton, on account of its cheapness two months ago compared to American growth. Spinners' supplies will, on the average, last till about the end of November.

Third. About 40 per cent of our mills returned to full time; those having army orders, especially weavers, are working overtime.

Fourth. On continuance of war we think conditions will even improve; of course all depends on what quantity of cotton will reach us.

Fifth. Funds for purchase of cotton are plentiful and readily furnished by banks heretofore engaged in cotton financing. All those concerned were well prepared and have not at all suffered by the war.

Sixth. German and English boats that have so far mainly carried American cotton to our harbors are, of course, out of question, and it will remain to neutral steamers to bring cotton to neutral ports, wherefrom it can safely be carried to our country. We do not doubt that in the event of larger cotton shipments, compared with former years, to certain ports the English Government will under some pretense capture such cotton, especially if such steamers belong to smaller European nations. We would prefer to secure for our requirements in shipments on American bottom, and with the whole of our trade look to the American Government to protect the interest of the Southern States, whose property mostly all shipments will remain until landed at neutral port or destination. German and Austrian consumption of about 3,000,000 bales of cotton will mean a good deal to American producers.

Seventh. Mills have replaced by others practically all labor men who were called to the army. Spinners employ to a large percentage women hands. Many workmen are applying for work, and any vacancies could easily be filled.

Eighth. With exception of the steamship *Aurora* and such cotton now obtained at Antwerp, no cotton has reached this country after declaration of war. Within the last month spot cotton rose sharply to now about 92 pfennigs per one-half kilogram, which equals in American money, Bremen spot terms, 19.04 cents per pound. Any receipts of new crop cotton via neutral ports would, of course, lower prices decidedly.

Ninth. Our agents in the mill centers inquire daily for offers of cotton, and from all reports obtained a good consumption, in our opinion, is assured for all such cotton reaching our country up to two-thirds of its usual consumption, this the more as East Indian and Egyptian cotton does not come into question at all.

Our country appears to bear all perils of this dreadful war—which was forced on us—easier and better than other countries concerned. Everybody is assisting to his best the Government, the military authorities, the Red Cross, or the poor people. Rich and poor people are more united than ever.

Banks have not changed their financial arrangements with importing or exporting firms; all payments are regularly made, and banks claim to even have excessive credits from their clients, for which credit balances they allow partly an interest of 4½ per cent per annum.

The question of cotton imports to this country remains absolutely with the American Government, and whether this is strong enough or willing to protect the interest and property of American citizens crossing the ocean under American or other neutral colors from English capture.

Yours, very truly,

ADDIX & CARDES.

Moscow, October 6, 1914.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry of the 29th September, we are able to give you the following information:

1. In consequence of the war the consumption of American cotton has decreased 100 per cent, as there is no importation of cotton from America.

2. The stocks of American cotton are rather low, but the Russian cotton industry is supplied by our own cotton from the Turkestan district.

3. The reduction of time our mills are running is about 50 per cent of our normal work time.

4. The continuance of the war will no doubt affect the cotton-manufacturing business of Russia.

5. The obtaining of funds for the purchase of cotton is rather difficult, and £10 are now worth 125 rubles, compared with 95 rubles in time of peace.

6. There has been an intention to import cotton via Vladivostok, Siberia; as to the exportation of manufactured cotton goods, our connections with Persia, Mongolia, and China have not been affected in any way.

7. The supply of labor has decreased 20 per cent.

8. In consequence of the disturbance of transportation, the importation of American cotton to Russia has been entirely stopped.

9. Facilities for transportation would no doubt increase the consumption of American cotton in Russia.

We remain, yours, truly,

LA SOCIÉTÉ DE LA MANUFACTURE D'INDIENNES,
"EMILE ZUNDEL," A Moscow,
E. B. KANUFF, Director.

VILHELM TORKILDSEN.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 6866) for the relief of Vilhelm Torkildsen, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 6972) granting a pension to Sarah E. Marsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 6973) governing the reclamation of desert-land entries by the planting of trees, etc., and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6974) for the relief of desert-land entrymen in Fresno and Kings Counties, Cal. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 6975) for the relief of Minor Berry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 6976) granting an increase of pension to Luther M. Blackman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 6977) to amend section 4215 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 6979) granting a pension to George Troutman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

EFFICIENCY OF THE ARMY.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a bill to increase the efficiency of the Army. It is an embodiment of the recommendations of the Secretary of War in his report. Similar bills perhaps, which I have not noticed, have been already introduced. I hope so. This measure no doubt can be much perfected by the committee, but I think the recommendation of the Secretary of War should be brought before the Senate. Therefore I introduce the bill and ask that it be read twice and be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I also ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 6978) to increase the efficiency of the Army was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to fill up to their full strength the existing organizations which compose the aggregate mobile Army force, as recommended in the report of the Secretary of War for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914; and that he be further authorized to appoint not more than 1,000 officers for commands in this increased force.

SEC. 2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to discharge enlisted men from the service at the expiration of 18 months if satisfied that they are proficient in the duties of a soldier.

SEC. 3. That the men discharged in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this act shall constitute a reserve and shall be subject to be called back to military service in time of war.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Saturday, January 9, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to consider resolutions in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of my late colleague, Hon. JOSEPH FORNEY JOHNSTON.

LITERACY TEST IN IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that I shall move at the proper time to strike out from the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States lines 10, 11, and 12, on page 8. These words embrace the literacy test, so called, in the immigration bill and are as follows:

All aliens over 16 years of age physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Tuesday, the 5th day of January, immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall, with the permission of the Senate, submit some remarks on the Public Health Service.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5849. An act to amend section 100 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911;

H. R. 12750. An act relating to procedure in United States courts; and

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR BACON.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, in pursuance of the notice heretofore given by me, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia submits resolutions, which the Secretary will read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 503) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the second resolution the Senate will proceed with the memorial services touching the character and high standing of the late Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is with consciousness of a great loss that I ask the Senate to consider the high character and distinguished public service of AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON. To say that by his death the Senate lost one of its ablest and most experienced Members feebly expresses the truth.

He came to the Senate splendidly prepared for the work. He was, when elected, a business man of unusual experience, an able lawyer, and a trained legislator and parliamentarian.

He served in the Senate 19 years. During his service here he was tirelessly industrious; he realized that the entire business of the Nation, as well as the legislative hopes of the people, were covered by the measures considered by the Congress, and that the smaller size of the Senate gave opportunity for each Senator to contribute toward perfecting each measure with no limitation other than his ability and his capacity for labor.

Senator BACON gave to the duties of the Senate all of his ability and all of his time. Service as a Senator was the thought and the joy of his life. Accurate and painstaking by nature and by training, he brought to the service a devotion rarely equalled—never excelled.

Senator BACON was born October 20, 1839, in Bryan County, Ga., although the home of his parents was Liberty County. His ancestors upon one line were among the earliest settlers of Virginia. Upon another they were with the colony of Puritans who settled in Dorchester, Mass., in 1630. Some of the latter removed to Georgia in 1753 and founded what was known as the Midway Colony, afterwards called Liberty County. On both lines his ancestors were soldiers and officers in the Revolutionary Army. His father died before his birth, and his mother died before he was a year old. His parents are buried in the cemetery of the Midway Church, and he was born in the atmosphere of this church.

Liberty County, Ga., was the home of two signers of the Declaration of Independence, Lyman Hall and Button Gwinnett. Midway Church had among its pastors most distinguished men, among others Dr. J. S. K. Axson, grandfather of the wife of President Wilson, and Dr. Abel Holmes, the father of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes and the grandfather of Mr. Justice Holmes. The mother of Theodore Roosevelt, who was the granddaughter of Gen. Daniel Stewart, was also a member of Midway Church. Midway Colony, or Liberty County, was the birthplace of John and Joseph Le Conte, the celebrated scientists.

Before he was one year old, Senator BACON was adopted by his grandmother. Under her guardianship he was carefully trained and received a good elementary education. At the age of 16 he entered the University of Georgia. He graduated from the collegiate department in 1859, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Arts. The following year he received from the institution the degree of Bachelor of Laws, having been a member of the first law class graduated by that university. He was a trustee of the University of Georgia at the time of his death and had been a trustee for many years. Few of his attachments were stronger than that which tied him to the State university. The University of Georgia successively conferred upon him the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Laws, Master of Arts, and Doctor of Laws, the latter degree having been conferred in 1909. He selected Atlanta, Ga., as the place in which to begin the practice of his profession.

Before the end of 12 months thereafter he joined the Confederate Army and was made adjutant of the Ninth Georgia Regiment, in which position he served in Virginia during the campaigns of 1861 and 1862. He was afterwards commissioned

as captain in the provisional army of the Confederate States and assigned to general-staff duty. He was married on April 19, 1864, to Miss Virginia Lamar, in Macon, Ga.

At the close of the war he was mustered out of service with the rank of captain. He then renewed his legal studies and began practicing law in Macon, Ga.

Senator BACON combined as a lawyer to an unusual degree ability to present with power a client's case to judges or to juries. He added to his thorough knowledge of law capacity as a business man, thus rendering his service to his client of unusual value. His success at the bar was almost immediate, and so long as he gave himself to his profession he enjoyed a lucrative practice and a most distinguished position among his legal associates.

For a number of years he was employed in practically every important case tried in middle Georgia, yet so great was his industry that in addition to his law practice and his legislative services he found time to prepare and publish in two volumes a digest of the supreme court decisions found in the first 40 volumes of the Georgia Reports, and so thoroughly and accurately did he do this work that his volumes at once found space in the libraries of the lawyers of the State.

In 1868, when Mr. BACON was 28 years old, he was nominated by the State Democratic convention for presidential elector. Two years afterwards he was elected a member of the Georgia House of Representatives. He was reelected to that body continuously for a period of 12 years, and was subsequently again elected for a term of 2 years. He was speaker pro tempore for two years and speaker for eight years. In 1883 he was a candidate for the governorship of his State, and in the Democratic convention he lacked but one vote of receiving the nomination, when a nomination would have assured his election. He was several times a member of the State Democratic conventions of his State, was chairman of the convention in 1880, and was delegate from the State at large to the Democratic national convention at Chicago in 1884.

In 1894 he was elected to the United States Senate by the Georgia Legislature. In 1900 he was nominated at a Democratic State primary for the Senate, and was afterwards unanimously elected to the Senate by the legislature, composed of Democrats, Republicans, and Populists. In 1906 he was again indorsed in the State Democratic primary, having no opposition, and was again unanimously elected to a third term in the Senate. He was the first Georgian to be elected to a third consecutive full term in the United States Senate. In 1912 he was again renominated in the State Democratic primary. Before the legislature met the amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the election of Senators by the people had become effective. When the legislature met it promptly provided machinery for the election of a Senator by the people. An election was called and Senator BACON had the distinction of being the first Member of the United States Senate elected by the people under the operation of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. At the time of his death he had served but one year of his fourth term as United States Senator.

Senator BACON was physically strong and vigorous, the result of his simple and abstemious life and habits. He inherited a naturally strong mentality from his ancestors, and from his earliest youth until his death he assiduously cultivated and strengthened his natural mental powers. He was prepared for every line of work which came before the Senate, and, while he enjoyed it all, it is probably true that problems connected with our foreign relations were to him the most interesting. He was at the time of his death a member of the Committees on the Judiciary, Rules, Railroads, Private Land Claims, and Expenditures in the Post Office Department. He was a member of the Judiciary Committee for 17 years, of the Foreign Relations Committee for 15 years, and of the Committee on Rules for 13 years.

For many years he had been ranking Democratic member on each of these committees, while his party was in the minority in the Senate, and upon the Democratic reorganization of the Senate in March, 1913, he became chairman of the powerful Committee on Foreign Relations, for which he was so well fitted, and which position he preferred to any in the Senate.

Though the Republicans were in the majority in the Senate and Judge Archbald was himself a Republican, Senator BACON was unanimously chosen to preside over the Archbald court of impeachment—a splendid tribute to his ability and fairness. The hearing lasted continuously during several weeks, and there were 11 active lawyers representing the two sides, yet all of Senator BACON's rulings at this trial were sustained.

He considered punctuality in his attendance upon the sessions of the Senate as one of his highest duties. In a career of

practically 19 years he was never absent a day from the Senate on account of either his personal business or his pleasure. The few times that he was absent were due to providential causes solely.

He had a deep concern for the proprieties of the Senate and held its traditions in high reverence. He was a vigilant guard and an able defender of the Constitution and was zealous in defending State rights.

He was a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution and took a deep interest in its affairs.

As a speaker he was most effective on account of his clear statements and convincing logic. His studious habits had developed and strengthened his reasoning powers and gave him a wide command of language. He seldom delivered a set oration, but was always ready to discuss and did discuss the varied subjects which came before the Senate, such as constitutional questions, treaties, foreign relations generally, the tariff, currency, railroad rates, the Panama Canal, representative government, the Philippines, Cuban independence, the relations between Congress and the executive departments, State rights, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, education, and agriculture. In fact, he discussed practically every important subject that came before Congress during his service of about 19 years. He was especially strong in debate on constitutional questions and matters of foreign relations.

One of his most notable efforts was in opposition to the acquisition of the Philippines. He introduced a resolution "declaring the purpose of the United States not permanently to retain the islands, but to give the people thereof their liberty." In this connection he delivered a speech that aroused deep interest in the Senate and widely commanded the attention of the public not only in this country but abroad. The vote on the resolution was a tie, and it was defeated by the vote of the Vice President—the first occasion in many years where there had been a tie vote in the Senate upon any question and upon which a Vice President had voted.

Senators were much impressed with the strength of his argument on the "Relations between Congress and the executive departments"; that is, the power of the Senate to call for information from executive departments. A debate between Senator Bacon and Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, on the constitutional power of the President and the Senate in making treaties was of unusual interest and attracted widespread attention. Referring to this debate, the Hartford (Conn.) Courant editorially commented as follows:

Take down an old volume of the Congressional Globe and read one of the debates on foreign affairs in which Lewis Cass and John M. Clayton were pitted against each other—for instance, the debate (famous in its time) on the merits of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Then take Monday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the report therein of the debate between Mr. BACON, of Georgia, and Mr. SPOONER, of Wisconsin, on the constitutional powers of the President and of the Senate in treaty making. It would be scant praise to say that the Bacon-Spooner debate is the more readable of the two. For intellectual vigor, grip of the matter in hand, compactness, and the lucidity of statement, brisk alertness in the give and take of dialectic fence, and last, but not least, good English, the Bacon-Spooner debate is the abler of the two. Daniel Webster would have listened to every word of it attentively, with keen interest and pleasure; Calhoun and Clay also.

No Senator took a more active part in debate than Senator Bacon when the Dingley tariff bill was before the Senate, and later, in 1900, when the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was under discussion. He made strong arguments in favor of material reduction of duties on all articles of universal and necessary use—embracing the whole range of things essential to the comfort, health, and convenience of the people.

Two speeches by the Senator on the amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators be elected by the direct vote of the people were powerful appeals in behalf of the rights of the States and the preservation of white supremacy.

While considering our foreign relations he was ever zealous to maintain the rights of his own country, while he was at the same time broad and brave enough to be just to other countries. The following resolution of sympathy was adopted by the Assembly of the Department of Santander, Colombia, on the Senator's death:

Interpreting the patriotic sentiments of the worthy people whom it represents, and considering the expression of its sympathy and appreciation as an act of justice to those who have labored or labored for the supreme rights of the country and humanity, it deeply regrets the death of Senator BACON, who placed his highest abilities at the service of Colombia and the weak nations, battling for her in the Congress of his country in connection with events that took place in Panama.

Senator Bacon died in Washington during the last session of the Senate. Funeral services were conducted in this Hall. When his body reached Georgia it was placed in the capitol. Public officials and the people of the State did honor to his memory. His body was carried to Macon, where he had so long lived, and was followed to the beautiful cemetery upon the banks

of the Ocmulgee by his wife, his surviving daughter, his grandchildren, and throngs of friends.

The Legislature of Georgia at its session last summer passed a bill proposing an amendment to the constitution to create a new county to be called Bacon in honor of Senator BACON, and on November 3 of this year the people of the State, at a general election, overwhelmingly ratified the amendment. It was a distinct tribute to him that the county should have been created in his honor so soon after his death.

Senator BACON was splendidly equipped for service in this body. With a lofty sense of the responsibility resting upon a Senator, he discharged all the duties of the office. He was a great Senator in the broadest meaning of the word. He is missed by his colleagues. His place will be difficult to fill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, one of the severest penalties of advancing years is found in the loss of old friends, of those with whom we have lived, which accompanies the passing of the

Daughters of Time, the hypocritical days.

That these words which I have just spoken are both a commonplace and a truism only adds to their sadness. But the inevitable partings with friends brought by the gathering years are accentuated when the separation occurs between those engaged in a common labor or service. At every turn of the well-trodden path we look in vain for a familiar figure, and each incident of the day's work whispers that there is a vacant space by our side which never again can be filled. The oncoming ranks press forward, but they are not the same, and the gap made in the lives of those who survive does not close.

These thoughts come very keenly home to me when I speak of the death of Senator BACON. For 18 years we served here together in the Senate. For 15 years we sat facing each other as members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, where association is close and constant, and where political divisions rarely enter. I saw much of him, also, outside the Capitol, and I met him more than once in Europe, for he traveled wisely and widely when Congress was not in session. Thus I came to know him well. In this way he grew to be a part of my daily life. We belonged to different political parties; we had been bred in widely different schools of political thought; on questions involving party principles we were always opposed. Outside of party politics there were many matters, many aspects of life and of the conduct of life, upon which we agreed and sympathized. We had, as was inevitable, many clashes in debate, but nothing ever affected our personal friendship, which became constantly closer and more affectionate with the passing of the years.

I think, therefore, that I knew Senator BACON well and felt for him such affection that I can speak of him with both knowledge and justice. He came to the Senate with a high reputation as a lawyer, as a public man of large experience in his own State, and as a master of parliamentary rules and practice, derived from his service as speaker in the Georgia Legislature. He at once took a position in the Senate such as is rarely accorded to a new Member, and in a very short time was recognized not only as a leader on his own side but as a leader in the Senate. This was due not merely or chiefly to his ability or to his industry, or to his constant and unwearied attendance at the daily sessions and his watchfulness in regard to legislation, but to the fact that from the day he took the oath of office he was with all his strength and all his mind a Senator of the United States in the largest and highest sense. He felt a great pride in the Senate as a body. He was sensitive as to its rights and jealous of its constitutional prerogatives. He was not ready to suffer any detriment to come to either. It is owing to Senators like Senator BACON that the Senate has held throughout our history the place and power in our Government which belong to it, and when Senators become indifferent to the position of the body to which they belong, all the power and influence so long possessed by the Senate in our Government will fade away.

Senator BACON took an especial interest in all legal questions and in all questions affecting our foreign relations, upon which, owing to his large experience and his familiarity with other countries, both through reading and travel, he was peculiarly qualified to speak with authority.

We all recognize the loss caused by the death of Senator BACON to the public service of the country, to his State, and, above all, to the Senate. But the feeling that is uppermost in the hearts of those who served with him here for so many years is one of personal sorrow. He was a true and loyal friend when his friendship had once been given. He was a thorough gentleman, as incapable of a mean or low action as he was incapable, even in the asperities of heated debate, of mean in-

situation or of a low personal fling at an opponent. He was kindly and affectionate always. More sorrows had fallen to his lot than is the usual portion of all who live out the term of years allotted by the Psalmist, but he faced his griefs and trials with a manly, cheerful courage, very pathetic to those who knew him well. Honored and mourned by his State and by the Nation, he leaves to us a gracious, happy memory of one who was an affectionate friend and an able and faithful servant of his country.

There is abundant cause here for both public and private sorrow. There is no place for lamentation. Senator BACON died full of years and honors, to use our consecrated phrase. In war and peace he had tasted of the great emotions which make life worth living. He had lived the life of his time, and he died in service, as he would have wished to die. Think how much that meant to him, how much it means to us. The waiting in helpless idleness for the inevitable close of all things earthly, the weary hours of the sick room, the "set, gray life and apathetic end," all these were spared to him. It is better to wear out than—

* * * to hang
Quite out of fashion, like a rusty mail,
In monumental mockery.

To him, most fortunate, it was given to say, as it is permitted to so few to say when the years have gathered thick in serried ranks behind them:

Blow, wind! come, wrack!
At least we'll die with harness on our back.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, death is so full of solemn mystery that I am prone to stand silent in its presence. Before the Specter of death even thought itself is hesitant, and like unto a tired bird would fold its wings; and speech, however phrased, falls upon my ear like a note sounded from a chord out of tune. My speech, therefore, shall be characterized by brevity.

On Sunday last I attended the funeral services held in the Hall of the House in memory of Representative PAYNE, of New York. To-day we are assembled in the Senate Chamber to pay tribute to Senator BACON, of Georgia. Both were among the most conspicuous and potential American public men of our day. They lived and wrought in the same period, and largely in the same arena. Death came to them in the same way, and not many moons apart. Their lives, distinguished by many important and useful services to their country and mankind, were snuffed out, almost without warning, as suddenly and quickly as a flash, which for a moment lights some far off summer cloud, sinks into darkness and disappears.

Oh, the mighty mystery of it, and with what reverential awe the human mind contemplates this swift transition from life to death! And yet full well we know that after all and at best a single life is but a speck on the unfolding scroll of time, and but little more than that on the record of human experiences and history. This is as well true of those we call great as of those the least known. The span of life is so little—so insignificant—that it can hardly be counted as a separate space in the endless course of time. In truth, those accounted great—those who escape oblivion—come and go like all their kind of whatever degree, and the time comes in after years when the world no longer remembers the real great man as he was, as his contemporaries knew him, but remembers only his deeds; and remembers his deeds, if at all, only because of their influence and effect on the progress of the world and the fortunes of the human race.

This thought, Mr. President, that in time one will be remembered only for his deeds, should be a high and noble inspiration to every man to so live and strive that the sum of his life work may exert some influence for good upon the everlasting struggle of mankind for better things.

AUGUSTUS O. BACON was full to the brim with this inspiration. I shall not here trace the history of his career. That can be better done by the Senators from his own State, so long and intimately associated with him in private and in public life, or perhaps by some other friend who may care to speak with greater particularity. For me it is sufficient to speak in simpler vein—sufficient merely to avow my firm belief in his splendid courage and superb integrity. His ideals were high; his regard for any service he undertook was scrupulous; his devotion to duty was passionate and unflagging; his patriotism, wrought into his very life, flamed like a torch whose light fell upon his whole country and all its people. He loved books and music; he was traveler and scholar; he was soldier and statesman; he was a Christian and a gentleman. What more need be said? What more, indeed, can be said "to give the world assurance of a man"?

He will be sadly missed from our council and in our labors; and especially in this time of tremendous international stress, when we stand in ever-increasing need of learning, sagacity, and guidance, are we keenly conscious of our loss. But so it is, and it boots naught to lament. His life was well rounded, and more nearly reached the full limit of its possibilities than fate or fortune allows to most men. If, unlike Cardinal Wolsey, he did not sound all the depths and shoals of fame, he did sound many of them without wreck; and if he did not scale the highest peak, he did climb some of the loftiest without falling. Maybe it is better for him as it is. His work—constructive, upbuilding, and beneficent—has left an influence for good which will make his name a precious memory. His stalwart form is crumbling into dust, but his spirit, his soul, has entered upon new and nobler activities in a higher and infinitely better sphere. How do I know? Only because I still believe in the eternal Triune God my mother told me about as I knelt at her knees—that sweet and sacred altar of my childhood faith.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, when Senator BACON passed away to his final rest on the 14th of February, 1914, in the seventy-fifth year of his age and in the maturity of his power, the Senate lost in him one of its strongest, ablest, and most efficient Members, one to whom we could always look for valuable advice, information, and instruction. Gifted by nature with a vigorous intellect, which he developed and fortified by a broad and liberal education, he was well equipped in his youth for the active and strenuous duties of life. What happened to so many young and promising men, North and South, on the eve of the great struggle which began in 1861 happened to him. Though educated and trained for the pursuits of peace, yet his first active and pronounced work was that of war, that of an officer in the Confederate Army, in which he proved himself an able, courageous, and efficient officer, faithful to the end to the cause which he had espoused. In 1861, from the heights back of Arlington, in his Confederate uniform, he beheld the dome of that Capitol which he entered as a United States Senator in 1895. The war had exhausted and impoverished the South, and the problem of reconstruction retarded to some extent the work of recuperation. It was not altogether an easy task for the returning soldiers of the North to resume the avocations of peace, and it must have been much harder and much more trying and difficult for the soldiers of the South. The former returned to a prosperous country, while the latter returned to a country where stagnation and paralysis, as a result of the war, prevailed. It was under such circumstances and conditions that Senator BACON embarked in the practice of law in 1866, the year following the close of the war, and in the period of reconstruction. While by intellect and training a thorough, able, and most conscientious lawyer, I can readily conceive that under the circumstances he found it at first uphill and not very remunerative work; but his ability and persistency in due time, as the country gradually recuperated, met with its reward, and he soon became one of the leaders of the bar in his State. As a lawyer he was painstaking, thorough, and honest. He was not a mere case lawyer, but one who was versed and well grounded in the fundamental principles of jurisprudence. He was a close student of our constitutional law, and believed in adhering to its fundamental principles, its checks and balances. He was of a conservative temperament and trend of mind, and hence his opinion on great constitutional questions was deliberately formed and of great value.

After having firmly established himself as a lawyer and becoming well known for his proficiency and skill in that calling, at the instance of his people he entered the political arena of his State as a member of its legislature, in the lower house, where he served for 14 years in all, 8 years of that time as speaker and 2 years as speaker pro tempore.

As a legislator he was safe, sound, and moderately conservative, with a talent for constructive and remedial legislation. As a presiding officer he was patient, fair, and impartial, aiming to keep the deliberations of the body over which he presided within the pale of parliamentary law. In the legislature he was looked up to as a guide and leader whom it was safe and best to follow. He was no truculent time-server nor weather-vane gazer. He stood for what he believed was just, right, and for the public welfare.

The people of Georgia approved of his course and his work, and as a token of their approval in the fall of 1894 elected him to the United States Senate for the term commencing March 4, 1895. He was thrice reelected, and passed away in the first year of his last term. He was the first Senator elected by a popular vote of the people under the recent constitutional amendment.

Few, if any, have ever entered this body better equipped for the great work entailed on its Members, who are not only acting as legislators but as advisers of the President in the matter of our diplomatic affairs and in connection with appointment to office. He was assigned, among other assignments, to the important Committees of Judiciary and Foreign Relations, and in the great work of these committees he took a prominent and leading part. In the proceedings on the floor of the Senate he took a leading and pronounced part from the very beginning. He was nearly always in his seat, vigilant and watchful.

Nothing escaped his attention. Though not an orator in the common acceptance of the term, it can be truly said that he was a first class and ready debater, thorough and exhaustive, ready to take and give blows. But he was always fair, honorable, and manly. There was nothing rough or rude in his behavior to an antagonist. He was always the thorough gentleman, true to his cause, his training, and his environment. To me he always appeared in public and in private as a connecting link between the old and the new South. In his attitude and demeanor he seemed to me like one of the gentry of the old South infused with the progressive spirit and aspirations of the new South. Faithful to his past and the past of his country, he was nevertheless truly alive to the great future of our country and ready to give it a helping hand both North and South.

All of us who served in the great Civil War had much to learn and unlearn of each other; and we came out of that strenuous and drastic school wiser and better Americans and with more charity and good will for each other, and we all came to ultimately realize, as the wounds of the war were healed, that the God of battle had, after all, conferred a great blessing upon us in making us again a reunited country, stronger, more vigorous, and more progressive than ever. Our friend, the deceased Senator, died as zealous in the welfare of our common country as any who were opposed to him in the great struggle.

When at the beginning of this Congress the Democrats attained the ascendancy in this body, Senator BACON was at the head of his party upon the Committees on Judiciary and Foreign Relations, and he had the option of taking the chairmanship of either of these committees. He selected that of Foreign Relations, and it seemed to me that he chose wisely. While he would have made a most excellent chairman of the Judiciary Committee, yet his tastes, his aspirations, and, above all, his studies led him in the direction of our foreign affairs.

He had to my knowledge, after entering the Senate, been a close student of international law and of our diplomatic relations, and as a consequence was in a high degree qualified for the chairmanship of this important committee. And it was his ambition to take a leading part in the adjustment of our foreign affairs and diplomatic relations, and I feel sure that had his life been spared he would have been most helpful to the administration of his party in guiding it in its relations with foreign nations.

I remember very well when, during the first session of this Congress, there was a disposition in certain quarters to have our country resort to armed intervention in the affairs of Mexico, how he frowned upon such a course, and how anxious he was to avoid everything that savored of war. It seems sad, and it must have seemed sad to him, in his last conscious moments, to be cut off by death at the very threshold of the new duties and great work he had assumed. Death, however, is no respecter of human wishes and human aspirations. The summons comes oftentimes when we least expect it and when we are reluctant to go, but we are, on the whole, safe in assuming that the dispensations of an All-Wise Providence are for the best, and in saying: "Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in Thy sight."

Fifty-four Senators, who were Members of this body when Senator BACON first entered, have since passed away, and 44 Senators and one Vice President have since that time died while in the public service. I append a list of these latter to my remarks. It is a most notable roll of the men who have been our guides and leaders during this generation. Next to the last on this roll is our departed associate, to whom we pay our tribute on this occasion. He has left us, but the example he gave and the results of the work he wrought abides as an instructive and hope-engendering lesson for us and for our posterity.

List of United States Senators who have died while in the United States Senate from the Fifty-fourth Congress, inclusive, to the present time.

Joseph H. Earle, South Carolina, May 20, 1897.
 Isham G. Harris, Tennessee, July 8, 1897.
 James Z. George, Mississippi, August 14, 1897.
 Edward C. Walthall, Mississippi, April 21, 1898.

Justin S. Morrill, Vermont, December 28, 1898.
 Monroe L. Hayward, Nebraska, December 5, 1899 (never attended).
 John H. Gear, Iowa, July 14, 1900.
 Cushman K. Davis, Minnesota, November 27, 1900.
 James H. Kyle, South Dakota, July 1, 1901.
 William J. Sewell, New Jersey, December 27, 1901.
 James McMillan, Michigan, August 10, 1902.
 Marcus A. Hanna, Ohio, February 15, 1904.
 Matthew S. Quay, Pennsylvania, May 28, 1904.
 George F. Hoar, Massachusetts, September 30, 1904.
 William B. Bate, Tennessee, March 9, 1905.
 Orville H. Platt, Connecticut, April 21, 1905.
 John H. Mitchell, Oregon, December 8, 1905.
 Arthur P. Gorman, Maryland, June 4, 1906.
 Russell A. Alger, Michigan, January 24, 1907.
 John T. Morgan, Alabama, June 11, 1907.
 Edmund W. Pettus, Alabama, July 27, 1907.
 Stephen R. Mallory, Florida, December 23, 1907.
 Asbury C. Latimer, South Carolina, February 20, 1908.
 Rodfield Proctor, Vermont, March 4, 1908.
 William Pinkney Whyte, Maryland, March 17, 1908.
 William James Bryan, Florida, March 22, 1908.
 William Boyd Allison, Iowa, August 4, 1908.
 Martin N. Johnson, North Dakota, October 21, 1909.
 Anselm J. McLaurin, Mississippi, December 22, 1909.
 Samuel Douglas McEnery, Louisiana, June 28, 1910.
 John Warwick Daniel, Virginia, June 29, 1910.
 Jonathan P. Dolliver, Iowa, October 15, 1910.
 Alexander Stephen Clay, Georgia, November 13, 1910.
 Stephen B. Elkins, West Virginia, January 4, 1911.
 Charles A. Hughes, jr., Colorado, January 11, 1911.
 William P. Frye, Maine, August 8, 1911.
 Robert L. Taylor, Tennessee, March 31, 1912.
 George S. Nixon, Nevada, June 5, 1912.
 Weldon B. Heyburn, Idaho, October 17, 1912.
 James S. Sherman (Vice President), New York, October 30, 1912.
 Isidor Rayner, Maryland, November 25, 1912.
 Jeff Davis, Arkansas, January 3, 1913.
 Joseph F. Johnston, Alabama, August 8, 1913.
 AUGUSTUS O. BACON, Georgia, February 14, 1914.
 William O. Bradley, Kentucky, May 23, 1914.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, Senator BACON died while the Senate was in session. When it was suddenly announced in the Senate that Senator BACON was dead, it was a great shock to all. A solemn stillness pervaded this Chamber. Sorrow was depicted upon every face and all realized that a great man had fallen, one whose place would be very hard to fill, and the State of Georgia and the country had lost a great leader.

Now, when we have stopped the wheels of legislation and have set apart this hour to pay honor to his memory, to pay to him the last tribute we can ever pay in this world, I, as his friend, desire to add my simple tribute to his memory.

I admired him for his ability. I held him in high esteem for his character and his services to his country. I admired him for his statesmanship and devotion to duty. I esteemed him for his friendship.

When I came to the Senate 12 years ago he had served his State here for 8 years, and his reputation then had been established as one of the leaders of the Senate. I confess that at first my estimate of him, from a personal standpoint, was shattered. I have noticed since that time that with the new Senators at first he was not popular. He appeared unapproachable and unsympathetic, but to the older Senators who knew him this was not so.

His paternal ancestors were Puritans, having first settled in Massachusetts in 1630. Upon this stock was grafted the cavalier, his maternal ancestors having settled in Virginia. Thus he had combined in him the dignity, austerity, cold, irresponsible, and retiring manners of the Puritan with the courage, gentleness, open, frank, positive, and refined qualities of the cavalier.

It was not long before my first impression was dispelled and that better and lovable side came out most vividly. Those who came in close touch with him not only admired but were personally fond of him. All respected him and esteemed him for his ability as a lawyer, a debater, and a constructive statesman.

Few States since the foundation of the Government have been more ably represented upon this floor than the great State of Georgia, but she has never been represented by a more useful Senator than Senator BACON. He was not equal in ability to Robert Toombs; he did not have the logic and was not possessed of the great reasoning faculty and statesmanship of Alexander Stephens; he was not as great and eloquent a debater as Ben Hill; but he was a splendid debater, logical and at times eloquent. He was an able lawyer, superior to either one of these great Senators as a parliamentarian, and was more diligent and untiring in his work upon committees. If all of these had been Members of this Senate at the same time, AUGUSTUS O. BACON would not have suffered by comparison. In any parliamentary body on earth he would have been recognized as a leader among leaders. He was not a colossal figure in the public eye. He was by no means commonplace, and no one would place him in the mediocre class.

No Member of this Senate was more regular in his attendance upon the meetings of committees and the sessions of the Senate. He was rarely absent from his seat and took part in all of the great debates. As a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations he was always ready to debate any great questions affecting the Constitution and inform the Senate upon any delicate questions affecting our foreign relations. He always enlightened the Senate upon these great questions whenever he spoke. His familiarity with the rules of the Senate and parliamentary law was remarkable, and he was the recognized authority on these questions. He was far from being a demagogue or the hypocrite. He was a manly man, always open, frank, and brave. He always stood up to be counted, and with courage always asserted his convictions with such force, frankness, and purity of purpose, that he won the respect of those who differed with him in forensic contests.

Here he ranked as one of the leaders of his party. He was so recognized, and justly so. His name is connected with much of the important legislation which for the last 20 years has passed this body and been enacted into law.

For 40 years he served his State faithfully, loyally, and with warm devotion to her interests. At the first call of his State for troops he volunteered to battle for her rights, and for four long years through the cruel and bloody war he rendered devoted and faithful service, first as adjutant of the Ninth Georgia Regiment and then as captain upon staff duty under Gens. Henry R. Jackson, Imboden, and Mackall. After the war he returned to his State, read law, and soon rose to the first rank among the great lawyers of that State. His oratorical talents and interest in public matters soon led him into the political arena. He served as presidential elector, and was elected 12 successive years as a member of the legislature and for 8 years was speaker of the house of representatives, in which position he served with honor and dignity. Many other positions of honor were conferred upon him by his party. He was considered one of the most aggressive and stalwart leaders in his State, and, recognizing his leadership and ability, his State elected him in 1894 to the United States Senate. Four times he was returned to this body, practically without opposition. The last time—in 1913—he was elected by a direct vote of the people under the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution. In this election he had the marked distinction of being the first Georgian elected for four successive terms and also the first Senator in the country elected by the people.

While he was not what might be called the idol of his people, they felt proud of him. Proud of the great record he made in the Senate and the honor he brought to the State. They believed in him as an honest, incorruptible man; as one who had served his State faithfully, loyally, and with unfiring energy; and they were glad to confer upon him these unprecedented honors.

Senator BACON was of a sanguine temperament. His high hopes and purposes were the result of his moral instincts and his intellectual convictions. Those who knew him best knew that he was full of sentiment. He was a deep lover of nature. He was fond of poetry and song. He loved the sunshine, the birds and flowers, the trees and running brooks. He was accustomed to take long walks and ramble through the woods in Rock Creek Park to commune with nature.

Though he never paraded it, Senator BACON was a worshipful man, full of reverence. He had an abiding faith in the immortality of the soul, and was a firm believer in the beautiful land of rest in the great beyond. These things he rarely spoke of, but in his last will, with his own pen, he had no hesitation in telling to his family and the world of his abiding faith, the evidence of things unseen, the substance of things hoped for.

He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

With him "life's fitful fever is over." It was permitted to him to live out his three score years and ten. He has crossed over the river and rests under the shade of the trees where separation, sorrow, sighing, and injustice shall be no more.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, a great man has gone from among us, full of years, of good works, and of deserved honors.

When the Senate loses one who for years has been among the most conspicuous and distinguished of its Members we but perform a solemn duty in placing upon the immutable records an expression of the Nation's grief and of our own sense of loss and bereavement.

AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON was not only an able and exceptionally useful Senator, but he was a distinct force in the life of his State and of the Nation, a strong champion of those broad principles and high ideals which he consistently advo-

cated during his long career in public life. His was an attractive personality; and as he walked among his fellow men he commanded a place of leadership and distinction which his colleagues readily accorded to him. Firm in his convictions and courageous in giving them expression, he was an opponent to be respected and a friend to be cherished. In all respects he was a high type of American citizen, a title which he greatly prized and upon which he reflected credit and honor.

He was elected to the United States Senate in November, 1894, and through the grateful appreciation of his native State served continuously as a Member of the Senate until February 14 of the present year, when, after many years of well-earned honors and rewards, his career came to a close.

Senators are familiar with his long record of service in this body, and in this presence I need not dwell upon the important part he took in our deliberations in committee and on the floor of the Senate. He brought to the discharge of his public duties rare natural gifts and talents, ripened by years of experience in the law and in State and National legislation. He was a man of scholarly tastes, profound erudition, and wide knowledge of the world. His mind was unprejudiced, vigorous, and comprehensive. In debate he was forceful and illuminating. His death took from the Senate one of its most experienced and efficient Members and deprived us of an instructive and companionable associate.

Those who had the privilege of knowing Senator BACON can not withhold the expression of affectionate admiration for his pure and distinguished patriotism, his exemplary life, his unsullied career. A survey of the accomplishments of the Senate during the past 18 years must evoke grateful remembrance of his sturdy, earnest, and zealous devotion to the service of his country. His fine dignity and unyielding respect for the great traditions of the Senate stamped him as a representative of that honorable old school of statesmanship which has contributed so much to the pride and glory of the Republic.

Most men of note live through but one career and win fame in one line of endeavor, along one road of duty and ambition, in a continuous and harmonious environment. It was the fate of Senator BACON to do more; he ran the whole gamut of those emotions and affections which have stirred the American people during the past 60 years. Having lived during the trying days of his youth as a loyal son of the South, the trials and conflicts through which he passed seem to have enriched his patriotism, and the early love which he bore for the Southland was but the budding of that deep and affectionate loyalty to the Republic which made him love each cherished spot where floats the Stars and Stripes. Out of the flames of the sectional conflicts of his youth came a national devotion of patriotic intensity. He loved his country and gave his life to her service. He was a thoroughly sincere man, who had nothing but public purpose to inspire him. Senator BACON grew old forcefully as well as gracefully, giving to the country the full and generous benefit of his ripened experience and mature judgment.

Georgia has played a noble and brilliant part in the battle of American progress. Her distinguished men have added much to the inspiring history of our national advancement, and among the most valued of her contributions to the general welfare were the career and public services of her illustrious son to whose memory to-day we pay the last tribute of friendship and admiration.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, hanging on the walls in my committee room in the Capitol, where I work from five to seven hours a day, are the photographs of some of my best friends, men whom I admire and love. Most of these are still living and are much my juniors. One of them is dead, and his kindly face beams down on me from the wall all the while and makes me feel sometimes as though he were present and going to speak.

We entered the Senate together in 1895, nearly 20 years ago, and during these years a warm friendship grew up between us. Our committee rooms were next to the Senate library and adjoined. Although he was my elder by several years, he always addressed me as "The old man"—"How is the old man to-day," being his usual greeting—and the name by which I addressed him most frequently was "My Lord Bacon."

I was at Robertson's Sanitarium in Atlanta last February when the news of his death was flashed over the wires, and immediately telegraphed the Vice President asking to be appointed on the committee to attend his funeral. When his body reached Atlanta I joined the committee and went on to Macon, and saw him laid away to rest in the beautiful cemetery on the hillside among his loved dead. While he was very reserved about family matters and rarely mentioned them, our intimacy led him once to tell me what a terrible grief came into

his life when his twin boys both died in one week. As I stood by his open grave I thought of his reunion with those children and how happy it must make him, and somehow the thought was very comforting to me.

He was very much loved by the people of his own city and State, and there were deputations from many parts of Georgia to attend his funeral. The people of that great State—like Virginia, the “mother of statesmen”—realized that they had lost another great man. I do not say “great man” flippantly, but advisedly. All men who become Senators do not thereby become great. The roll of great Senators is somewhat limited, and the average man would be puzzled to name 50 great Senators out of the hundreds during the entire period of our history. But BACON had qualities of mind which made him worthy to be called a great man. He was not merely a good politician and good fellow.

I married a Georgia woman and was born and reared within 13 miles of the Georgia line, and always had a great many friends in that State. It is a saddening thought that I have attended the funeral of two of Georgia's great men—BACON and Clay. They honored me by giving me their friendship.

BACON was a great lawyer. I will always remember an incident which occurred at a dinner at my home when I lived on East Capitol Street in this city. This was many years ago. I had formed a strong attachment for three of my colleagues, all of them lawyers—BACON, Spooner, and Chandler. Although I am a farmer pure and simple and never studied law at all, my official position as governor, during which time I had many lawsuits for the State, necessitated my reading many Supreme Court decisions. Then, too, in general reading I had become familiar with the principles of the law and knew a little something about the Constitution. Therefore I am not entirely ignorant or an unappreciative listener when law points are being discussed. On the occasion of which I speak (the dinner at my home) it will be noted that two of my guests were Republicans, both leaders of their party until they left the Senate. Although I am considered a partisan and am a very pronounced partisan in many respects, I never allowed my Democratic principles to interfere with my personal friendships. It is a source of pride to believe—indeed, to know—that a large number of the Republicans with whom I have been associated in the Senate during my 20 years' service are and have been my personal friends. Many of them have “gone over the river” where BACON has joined them. I must join that caravan, too, soon, for I am nearly “three score and ten” and realize every day that I am approaching the end. But I am prepared when the time comes to go to the grave—

* * * Not like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, I will approach my grave
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
About him and lies down to pleasant dreams.

But let us back to the dinner. I had a son who was at that time a law student at Georgetown University, and more for his encouragement than anything else I told those three great lawyers, who had climbed to the very top of their profession and then been given the highest office in the gift of their States, that I would be very much obliged if they would tell us something of their early trials and struggles. I started off with BACON, asking how much income he got from his first year's practice. He answered something like this: “TILLMAN, when I first began the practice of law I entered the office of Judge Lochrane, who was then at the head of the Macon bar and had a very large practice. Although the firm name was Lochrane & Bacon, I soon found very much to my disgust that all of the clients and even visitors to the office wanted to see Judge Lochrane, and none called for or wanted to see Mr. BACON. His reputation had thrown me into eclipse, and I decided that I could not afford this and therefore determined to withdraw from the firm and set up on my own hook. I did not get much practice at first, and money was so scarce that, to economize in every way possible, I used to sit without a fire with a blanket wrapped around my legs and feet to keep warm while reading. I really did not feel able to buy wood.”

Spoooner broke into the conversation with his reminiscences, laughing at the time, saying: “I was in debt when I hung out my shingle, and the first thing I did was to marry; but I did manage to make about \$1,500.”

Chandler came next with his experience and, as I recall it, he said: “I began practicing when 20 years old, also in company with a senior partner. I do not recall that I received much of anything that year. The next year, 1856, I practiced alone and made about \$1,300 or \$1,400—enough to pay board and lay up a little. After practicing nine years, before coming to Washington, I had managed to accumulate between four and five thou-

sand dollars. During that time, however, I recall that I interfered a great deal in politics.”

The picture of BACON shivering in the cold for the want of wood which he felt too poor to buy; Spooner battling with poverty and earning only \$1,500 per annum, while I know he gets more than that for some of his retainers now and often receives scores of thousands for a single argument before the Supreme Court; and Chandler in stringent circumstances because of lack of practice made a very lasting impression on my mind. Then, Chandler's describing his work as “interfering with politics” seemed ludicrous, especially the “interfering,” because those who know him well know how alert his mind is and quick to catch on to things. It amused Spooner and BACON as much as it did me to hear him thus characterize his activities in political matters. Indeed, his make-up has always puzzled me because of the odd mixture of mischief, earnestness, patriotism, selfishness, and sarcasm. He still “interferes” with politics and will do so until he dies. The lives and achievements of these three men are marked illustrations of the possibilities of our American civilization and demonstrate very forcefully that where men have the brains and energy they can carve a career in this country under very adverse conditions.

As our committee rooms were so near together, BACON and I frequently walked up Pennsylvania Avenue together, and on these walks we had long talks about politics, history, poetry, literature, and books we had read. I remember those walks with a great deal of pleasure now, because my pleasures now are mostly those of memory, and I presume other men, old and invalid like myself, are in the same condition.

He had a characteristic which made our association appear sometimes incongruous. His frame of mind was eminently judicial and he objected strenuously to any interruption; could not tolerate it, in fact. Indeed, no two men in the Senate were more different in temperament. He was calm and pacific at all times. I am impetuous and frank, and my strongest and most marked characteristic is perhaps pugnacity. Our friendship must have been due to the law which has been formulated thus: Men like their opposites, and not those who have the same foibles and feelings they themselves have. He was diplomatic or nothing, and no one ever even suspected me of having any feeling of that kind. I would frequently ask his opinion on a law point on some matter before the Senate or in the newspapers, and when he started to tell me I would see the point he was attempting to elucidate before he got to it, and would interrupt with some word showing I did not need further explanation. He always resented this very much, saying pettishly, “Tillman, you will not let a man tell you anything before you interrupt him.”

He was a man of very great refinement of feeling and disliked above all things to wound another. I never heard him in the Senate in debate say anything sharp, sarcastic, or vehement. Sometimes he grew earriest and even eloquent in discussing matters before the Senate, and I have heard him give the Republican Party a very severe drubbing more than once, but I never did hear him utter any such thoughts without apologizing for it—a salve for the wound, as it were. I have abused him many times good-naturedly for this weakness, which many will consider his finest characteristic. But, then, it was his nature to be kind and gentle, and he hated to say anything calculated to wound feelings or rankle in the memory like a thorn in the flesh. I have always considered this a weakness and have acted on the contrary principle. I never said anything unless I believed it to be true, and, if the truth hurts, I felt that it ought to hurt, for in that way only could reformation be brought about. Having served in the minority here for 18 years, I realize fully what it is to cultivate patience, and long for the time when my own party should have control.

BACON had a mind peculiarly filled with veneration for tradition and old customs. He was a stickler for the rules of the Senate, and very few Senators had a better knowledge of those rules or of Jefferson's Manual or was more familiar with the Constitution of the United States than he. He was always at his best in arguing a constitutional question or a legal point, though sometimes I thought him a little prolix and wordy. His membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations made it necessary for him to study international law and be familiar with treaties, and his knowledge of both was very extensive.

He was very fond of music, and in his home were two music boxes, one of the old Swiss type and the other a modern machine, which would reproduce the voices of great singers. Frequently we got together at his home or mine and spent the evening listening to good music.

He was very fond of travel and of reciting his experiences on his various trips to Europe. He made it his religious duty, after his first breakdown in the Senate, some 10 years ago, to

spend two or three months each summer in the Tyrolean Alps. He believed that these trips abroad had a great deal to do with his robust appearance and health and were necessary to prolong his life. Whether or not his failure to get away last summer had anything to do with hurrying the end, of course, we do not know, but he longed for the European mountains and was very much disappointed and put out because of his inability to go abroad. He felt that he could not afford to have the appearance of neglecting his duty, although he had been triumphantly re-elected for the fourth time by the people of Georgia the year before, and political consideration did not control his action or govern his feelings in any way. He stood by his post of duty and went down on the firing line, as it were. No soldier on the battle field ever showed more courage. Senators come and go, but it will be a long time before the Senate is adorned by a more able man or one more worthy the respect and admiration of his colleagues.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, others better fitted for the task than I have told the story of the life work of our late distinguished associate, the Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON, of Georgia. For me it is sufficient to say a few simple words of appreciation of a man whom I admired, a Senator of unswerving integrity, acknowledged ability, and universally recognized distinction, who in the discharge of his public duties shed luster not only upon his own State but also upon the country which he served faithfully and well.

When Senator BACON entered the Senate I had been a Member of the body for four years. Before he had taken the oath of office I was told by those who knew him well that he would take a high place in the Senate because of his extensive learning, his legislative experience, his legal acquirements, and his great ability as a debater and parliamentarian. In all these respects he abundantly fulfilled the expectations of those who vouched for him, speedily gaining deserved recognition and honor.

Senator BACON stood for all that is best in the history and traditions of this body. He insisted upon the observance of the rules which are designed to govern our deliberations, and he also insisted upon an observance of the precedents, social as well as otherwise, which have been handed down to us by our predecessors. A man of simple tastes and quiet living, he nevertheless contended that the Senate should be given its rightful place on all occasions and not be pushed aside or ignored by those who had less claim for recognition or priority. A true disciple of Jefferson in simplicity of life and manners, he was equally an aristocrat when occasion demanded. To him the pomp and circumstance of life meant little, but the amenities of life meant everything. He was a man of high ideals, of irreproachable character, and possessed of a courtesy and kindness of heart which bespoke the true gentleman.

For nearly 20 years it was my privilege to come in almost daily contact with this honored son of one of the original Thirteen States; and during all that time, whether in the routine of legislative procedure, of parliamentary contention, or in the heat and stress of debate, no wound was inflicted on either side that remained unhealed for an hour. A man of positive convictions and matured views, he extended to his colleagues the unquestioned right to opinions differing from those which he held and which he was always ready to defend. Thoroughly versed in the history and traditions of his own country, his wide knowledge of international affairs gave to his opinions an authority and influence possessed by few men in the history of our Government. The death of Senator BACON removed from this body one of its ablest Members and deprived the Nation of the wise counsel of a cultured, conscientious, and broad-minded legislator and statesman.

Mr. President, as I stood at the open grave of my associate and friend, in the beautiful burial ground at Macon; as I saw the great concourse of his friends and neighbors assembled to do him honor; as I saw the tears on the cheeks of family and kinsmen; as I listened to the words of the preacher, so full of tenderness and meaning, and as I looked beyond and saw those whom he had left, struggling for preferment above their fellows, I could not but ask myself what the real meaning of life is. And it then came to me, as it had so often come before and as it has come many times since, that the true meaning of life is not wealth nor fame nor glory, but rather that it is summed up in the few simple words of the Master:

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, * * * and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

And turning away from that scene of sadness and grief, bidding a long farewell to the great man whom I was privileged to call friend, I felt like consecrating my life and whatever

talents I possess to a deeper devotion to public and private service, and thus be prepared for the great change that will inevitably come to all of us, as it came to this gifted son of Georgia. And so to day I can but express the hope that his example will be to us an inspiration for all that is best in this world, and that the life and character of Senator BACON, as it will be read and recounted by the youth of his native Commonwealth, may beckon them on to higher purposes, to cleaner lives, and to greater achievements for the welfare of their fellow men, the State, and the Nation.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON, late a Senator of the United States from the State of Georgia, long represented and personified on this floor a type of statesmanship that is fast passing away, if, indeed, it be not already passed.

Imagine him clad in the toga of twenty-two hundred years ago, and it would not require a much more difficult stretch of the imagination to see in him, reincarnated, the highest type of the Roman senator at the very climax of that period when the senators of Rome were the lawgivers of the world. Compare him in all the essentials that made the senators of the world's great Republic illustrious and their integrity the proudest boast of a great people with them, and neither he nor American statesmanship suffers in the comparison.

Is high-minded personal and official integrity, that is not only beyond question but above suspicion, the first and all-essential requisite for lofty public service? If so, Senators, in this age of yellow journalism and of unwarranted license in the criticism of public men it should be an inspiration to every American schoolboy to learn what those of you who served longest with our dead friend know best—that in this great virtue he was second to no Roman Cato.

Is lofty patriotism, that exalts one's country above all earthly objects and enthrones the lasting good of her people as the one great object for which senates assemble and parliaments legislate, another essential and fundamental virtue? If so, Senators, we may all find comfort in the thought and draw inspiration from the fact that in the practice of this great virtue the late Senator from Georgia set for himself a standard not less lofty than that of the elder Brutus.

Is real and unassumed personal and official dignity, a due regard for the exact proprieties of every occasion, and a full appreciation of the greatness of the Imperial Commonwealth that sent him here so long and of the mighty Nation he loved and served so well to be appraised a virtue? If so, Senators, in these qualities your late colleague could be compared most favorably with the proudest Tarquin of them all.

Is the possession of a mind well stored with the legal lore of his people and his race, well trained in the measurement of wrongs and the weighing of conflicting rights, to be accounted a splendid part of the equipment of a great lawmaker? If so, Senators, in this respect the dead Senator whom we honor to-day was as splendidly equipped for the public service as any Roman Justinian.

Is that "righteousness that exalteth a nation" to be applied to its foreign affairs as well as to its domestic concerns? And is that man who, in his legislative conduct and career, seeks to apply the doctrine of the Golden Rule to other nations as well as to the citizens of his own to be adjudged truly great when the scales of public opinion shall be finally and justly balanced? If so, Senators, the late Senator BACON, who was for so long a time a potent factor for good in the conduct of our foreign relations, will not lose in stature when he is compared with even the greatest of those early Romans who stood for justice and square dealing, even with the despised barbarian, and even against the clamor of a fierce and war-loving nation.

Of Senator BACON's long and successful career at the Georgia bar, of which he was the acknowledged leader when elected to the Senate; of his splendid service to the people of Georgia while a member of her legislature, of whose house of representatives he was for eight years the honored speaker; of his unselfish devotion to the interests of his alma mater, the University of Georgia, even during those years in which the weight of public duties and responsibilities bore heaviest upon him; of his unflinching loyalty to the Democratic Party, both in our State and Nation, through many years of valued service, I may not on this occasion speak in detail, lest I become prolix.

Upon his great services in this Chamber through the past 20 years, touching almost every line of legislative and parliamentary activity, I may not with propriety dwell; for many of his honored colleagues, intimately associated with him in those activities, are still with us, and are far more competent than I am to recount his work and acclaim its worth.

I trust I may be pardoned, however, if I allude briefly to several particulars in which it has always seemed to me his influence was strongest and his work most fruitful.

First of all, he was diligent to a degree and constant without exception in his attention to the work of the Senate and in his attendance upon its sessions.

In the next place, he always attached great importance to the rules and precedents of the Senate. In respect to this matter, it may have seemed to the thoughtless, on occasion, that Senator BACON was overtechnical in his insistence upon following the rules of the Senate and in adhering to its well-settled precedents. Such was not the case, however; for he had acquired a profound knowledge of those rules and precedents, and with it an equally profound conviction that the rules and precedents of this great body all form part and parcel of a great comprehensive and complete system by which legislation in this Chamber is both accelerated and safeguarded, and that prudence requires that a legislative body shall steer according to its chart and compass, in this way securing the greatest general good and in this way scrupulously preserving the rights of all.

In the next place, during his long and potent connection with the foreign affairs of our country he brought to their consideration not only all the splendid equipment of a great legal mind but also a fine and fair sense of natural justice. In his consideration of these questions he had two maxims of conduct that, in my judgment, have proved invaluable to our country in the past and are indispensable to her safety, peace, and glory in the future:

First, that we should religiously adhere to the almost inspired advice of the great Father of his Country to cultivate friendly relations with all the nations of the earth and to have entangling alliances with none.

Second, that we can neither afford to bully the weak nor truckle to the strong, but should invariably accord to the weakest nation with which we have dealings the same consideration, the same justice, the same rights that we accord to the mightiest powers of earth.

Lastly, but by no means of least importance, Senator BACON had a fixed and accurate conception of the great American system of government—of the great dual system that distributes power between the Federal and State sovereignties—giving to each jurisdiction complete and supreme power in its own sphere of activity, and yet so adjusting the balance between them that real conflict is rare, if not impossible.

He believed with the intense fervor of enlightened conviction that our fathers had built wisely and not at haphazard when they ordained this dual system, and that in a rigid adherence to it lay the brightest and fairest hopes of permanent happiness and prosperity for the American people. He realized that the country was too large and that its conditions varied too greatly in different localities to permit, with safety, legislation by the Federal authority on matters that were purely local to the several States, and as to such matters that the right of local self-government was all important. On the other hand, he fully recognized and earnestly supported the supreme and exclusive authority of the Federal Government to deal with all foreign questions, with all questions relating to the national defense, with all questions relating to the regulation of commerce between the several States, and to exercise to the fullest extent every necessary power expressly bestowed on it or that could be clearly implied from the grant; and he was as stout in his assertion of the full and exclusive right and power of the Federal Government to perform every proper Federal function as he was unyielding in his devotion to the great Anglo-Saxon doctrine of local self-government in all purely domestic concerns and in respect to all matters that properly fell within the jurisdiction and power of the several States.

The great service that he rendered in this Chamber year after year in his earnest and unremitting effort to keep this balance between Federal and State power truly adjusted and to preserve to the people of this country the inestimable blessings of this great system of government to my mind constitute his most important public service, the chiefest glory of his long and distinguished career.

Mr. President, I have already trespassed far longer than I had intended upon the time of the Senate.

Senator BACON is gone from our midst, but his influence and his example remain with us, to help us all, to inspire us all to faithful service, and to lofty endeavor. The great State that he so long illustrated on this floor was proud of him in life and mourns him in death; but to console her in her grief, to comfort her in her sorrow, she has the proud realization that in her gift of him to our country she made notable contribution to American statesmanship; that his passing marks almost the last of an old and honored school, and that when death claimed him

it might have been truly said, "The noblest Roman of them all is no more."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 18, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 17, 1914.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, let Thy spirit come with all its quickening power into our hearts and abide with us, that with fidelity to Thee and to our fellow men we may do our work as it comes day by day without the fear or favor of men, for "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which can not be removed, but abideth forever," that we may have that peace which passeth understanding. In Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT OF THE ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The other day the President sent a message to Congress, transmitting the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, accompanied by two large volumes. The Chair referred the message and accompanying documents to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered it printed. It turns out that it has been printed, and therefore the Chair asks unanimous consent to cancel the order, so far as the printing of the documents is concerned. The Chair hears no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill, as follows:

For fuel, oil, grease, pipe, wire, and other materials needed for the maintenance and repair of boilers, engines, heating apparatus, electric lighting and power plant, and water-supply system; purchase and maintenance of teams; maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; material for boxing nautical instruments for transportation; paints, telegraph and telephone service, and incidental labor, \$8,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee what is the need for passenger-carrying vehicles in connection with the Naval Observatory. We provided last year that appropriations should not be used for this purpose unless specifically authorized. Apparently the committee has specifically authorized the use of money in every case, so that the law which we passed last year has only resulted in adding a few words to the bill this year. What need does the observatory have for vehicles to drive around in?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Under the current appropriations they could not have used the money for this purpose, and in every case they have asked us to put in a provision that would enable them to use it. As a matter of fact, I do not see much difference between operation under the present law and the old method except that it results in their furnishing the Committee on Appropriations, before the bill is made up, with the amount of money to be expended in that way.

Mr. MANN. I was opposed to the provision in the law last year. I took it that the purpose was to enable Congress to cut out some of this driving around Washington at the public expense. Of course each bureau or department that was maintaining vehicles at the public expense for private use has asked to have the specific authority given. Why do they need passenger-carrying vehicles at the Naval Observatory? Certainly they can not go to the moon with them.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They claim that they are so far out of town that they need them to communicate with the Navy Department and other departments. It looks like everybody in the Government service except Senators and Representatives have automobiles, or other means of conveyance, at the Government expense. But, as I said a moment ago, the only practical difference between our method of appropriation in this bill and the former bills is that in all the estimates it is now set out about how much money is to be expended in that way, and this information we did not have before.

Mr. MANN. You have information as to how much money they have spent, but there is no limitation as to the amount they may spend.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We have information how much they expect to spend.

Mr. MANN. But how much they will spend you do not know. I have no doubt that they will not expend any exorbitant amount. They spend what is necessary for that purpose. The question is whether we wish to make appropriations and to permit these gentlemen to ride in public owned and maintained vehicles. I have no jealousy, as far as I am concerned, but Congress last year had such a spasm of virtue on the subject, was so insistent on cutting out the right of anybody to ride in a public-owned vehicle unless specifically authorized; and yet this year I have not heard a word said in the House on the subject, although there have been many instances so far where we have specifically authorized the use of these vehicles.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That is correct; we have authorized it where they have asked for it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. While this subject is up it occurs to me that there is a considerable amount of passenger-vehicle service for the benefit of the heads of departments, and so forth. I would like to ask the gentleman how much money was expended last year for this particular item.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. About \$500.

Mr. GOULDEN. Was there any money expended last year for the purchase of a team?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. GOULDEN. I see that you insert the authorization for the purchase of teams again; I suppose that is the usual method of making up the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes; for a horse might die; but in the absence of some mishap of that kind they have no need to purchase a team.

Mr. COX. Was this money expended in hiring horses from a livery?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. No. Over at the Observatory they have large grounds, and they keep a team.

Mr. COX. Was this \$500 expended for horse feed and maintenance?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. For feed and maintenance.

Mr. COX. How many teams have they?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I think only one.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of computers on piecework in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac and in improving the tables of the planets, moon, and stars, \$3,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 83, line 12, by striking out "\$3,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "\$7,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the estimates called for a lump-sum appropriation of \$3,000, and they also asked that two men who have been employed out of the lump-sum appropriation for 11 years should be placed on the statutory roll. We did not grant their requests to put the men on the statutory roll in the preceding paragraph. It has been called to the attention of the Committee that if the men were not to be placed on the statutory roll they must be provided for in a lump-sum appropriation. Indeed, it is doubtful whether they can get through on \$7,000, because a good deal of the information has been secured through exchange with other Governments—something they may not now be able to do. They will

need every dollar of the amount heretofore appropriated. That is why I am asking that the amount be made \$7,000, and these two experts will be kept on the lump-sum roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I am not one who has been preaching economy. I recognize the difference between economy and parsimony, and I have not been one who has been talking about economy. In fact, I have no more regard for that portion of the Democratic platform than the Democratic Party itself has; but here is one place where it seems to me there is an absolute waste of money, and where there has been waste for several years. I have here the papers submitted in response to a resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator JONES, and if the gentleman from South Carolina had had an opportunity to read through these papers I am satisfied that instead of moving to make this \$7,000 he would move to strike it all out.

The appropriations that have been made for piecework in relation to the preparation of the Ephemeris have been wasted absolutely for several years. I tried to get the Secretary of the Navy under a Republican administration to do away with it, and I think probably he would if he had stayed in office a little while longer; but I was in hopes that this one piece of extravagance a Democratic Secretary of the Navy would have cut out, and I believe he would if he knew the facts. This report reveals some facts that I desire to call to the attention of the committee. In the first place, I find that Prof. Updegraff, who was the director immediately preceding Mr. Eichelberger, estimated the cost of the Ephemeris at \$10,700, and Prof. Harshman, who was the director for several years, estimated it at practically the same figure. I find that the first assistant, Mr. Robertson, estimates it at \$11,561. So that if we receive no assistance whatever from abroad, as you claim here, you would still have appropriated considerably more than is necessary. I find in looking over this report that the present director, Mr. Eichelberger says that, since the Paris conference which took place some three years ago—and which simply means an agreement that the different countries have to exchange work—the cost of preparing this Ephemeris was reduced to about \$6,000; and I further find in looking through this report, on page 103, that there was a board called on October 15, 1912, and that that board recommended that the piecework fund be discontinued, as it is not necessary. That board consisted of Profs. Eichelberger, Rice, and Harshman, the assistant, Mr. Robertson, and a gentleman named Morgan. It is somewhat remarkable that these men, who knew all about the conduct of that office, Mr. Harshman having been in the office for over 20 years, and seven years of that time a director, and Mr. Robertson having been there for 20 years, and Mr. Rice for a long period, should recommend that this piecework is wholly unnecessary, while Prof. Eichelberger, who had been in the office less than two years, and Mr. Morgan, who had been there but a short time, should think it needed.

The fact about it is that no one ever thought it was necessary to have this piecework done except the present director, and even under his own statement now, instead of increasing this amount for piecework, you ought to strike it out entirely, because this report shows all the way through, by every director who has been there, including the present one, that the preparation of this Ephemeris can well be done by the office force.

I desire to call the attention of gentlemen to this fact, that the English Ephemeris is prepared entirely by the office force of 7 men, while we have an office force over here of 10 men, and the work in the English office is just as heavy as it is here, and we have just as competent a force as they have over there. The truth about it is that the regular force now employed at the office of the Nautical Almanac can do all of the work in the office necessary to get out the Ephemeris and not work more than one-half their time, leaving them one-half of their time to be devoted to original investigation. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] where he received the information that it was necessary to have any of this piecework done outside of the office? I want to state this further fact, that some two or three years ago an occasion arose when it was necessary for me to investigate the conditions in the Nautical Almanac Office, and I discovered the fact then that this piecework was being farmed out; that it was let to certain gentlemen, and they then in some cases sublet it and made a profit upon it. One instance I recall, where a man obtained some piecework, he was paid \$600 for it, but he sublet it for some \$200. All of this piecework, so far as you can judge by this report, made up of records from the Nautical Almanac Office itself, is wholly unjustified, and apparently is made simply because the director wants to take care of a few of his favorites.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee on this little item. The people themselves are asking that these men be put upon the statutory roll instead of being kept on the piecework roll, and that is the very reason for the amendment. The committee did not see fit to put them on the statutory roll, and we are simply putting in the amount for piecework that has been appropriated for years. There is no increase in the appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Was the gentleman aware of the fact that this board of which I have read made a report to the Secretary of the Navy that there was no need for this piecework?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They are asking it right now in this year's estimates.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Who is asking it now?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The department.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman evidently did not understand what I said. I say the present director, Prof. Eichelberger, is the only man for years who has contended it was necessary to have this piecework; and this piecework, if it is necessary at all, is required simply because the present director does not himself know how to perform his duties and must employ some one to do his work for him. That is the truth about it. If the present director, who it appears from his own statements is wholly incompetent to fill that place, was transferred elsewhere, the present office force would do this work without outside help.

Now, I think that in times like these, where the work can be done by the office force, that we ought not to appropriate this \$7,000 simply because the director of that office wants it to hire some one to perform his duties for which he receives a salary of about \$5,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, Capt. Jayne was the Director of the Naval Observatory until a short time ago, and the last time he was before the committee he was asked this question:

Mr. JOHNSON. You do not think you could get along with any less force at the observatory?

Capt. JAYNE. Not and carry out the work we are doing. It is pretty hard work and we are hard pressed out there. Aside from the astronomical work of the observatory it is the depot for nautical instruments for the Navy and for surveying instruments for the Hydrographic Office. We could very well employ a greater force, if we had it, to advantage to the seagoing part of the Navy.

It is not necessary to waste time about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a few moments further. Now, if I can have the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina for a moment, because I am a little bit surprised that he should insist on carrying this appropriation in view of what this record, the report to the Senate, shows. I think it must be due to the fact that he has not investigated the situation. I wish I had time to read all of it, but it is too voluminous.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Why did not the gentleman bring this matter before the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, it is not my business to be running in every minute to try to direct the work of the committee. I am calling the attention of the gentleman to it now. I am pointing out now that there is no justification for the appropriation, and here is the report that shows it, and yet in the face of that fact the gentleman wants to increase the appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The Secretary of the Navy assumes the responsibility for these estimates as they came to this committee. He is presumed to have looked into this question. Where did the gentleman get his information?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I got it from this report right here, taken from the record as furnished by the department.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. What report?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Of this office itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Report to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. All of which convinces me the gentleman has been sitting over there and not paying any attention to what I have been saying or he would have understood what I have said. In reply to Senate resolution 424, July 17, 1914, introduced by Senator JONES, that calls for copies of all reports, letters, and memoranda prepared for or submitted to the superintendent of the Naval Observatory since July 1, 1909, concerning or relating to the cost of preparing the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac. I have not had time to go through this very thoroughly, but, if the gentleman will just listen to me for a moment, I find in there a detailed statement of the cost of preparing the Ephemeris—an estimate by different ones in regard to the cost of preparing it—and, remem-

ber, you are allowing \$15,000 in this bill; and, according to the statement of Prof. Eichelberger himself—and I can give you the page where he makes that statement—the Paris conference reduced the cost down to about \$6,000, although I understand now you say they claim they can not make that exchange. That is probably correct; I have no information upon that subject.

Now, here are the estimates made by Prof. Updegraff, who was in there immediately before Prof. Eichelberger. He gives a statement in which he goes into all the details and gives the cost of the Ephemeris at \$10,700. Then I find a statement in here by First Assistant Robertson, made in response to a request by Capt. Jayne, and he gives a detailed statement—gives every item—and he estimates the cost at \$11,561. Now, I do not find anybody who estimated the cost of that work higher except the present director. Then following on down in the report this board, composed of the men I have mentioned, all having been in the Naval Observatory and supposed to know more than anybody else about the subject, on page 105, says that the piecework system ought to be abolished and that the present force can do all the work. Now, in the face of that statement of men who know, contradicted only by the present director, you propose to increase this amount of \$3,000 to \$7,000, when the \$3,000 is not needed and should be stricken out. I do not care what you do about it—it does not affect me in any way—but I had, as I said, occasion some years ago to investigate this matter and was satisfied then that was an unjustifiable expenditure and retained only by political influence. Yesterday I went to Senator JONES and got these papers and looked through them, and I do not believe any man can read this report without becoming convinced that it has been an absolute waste of money not only now but for several years past to have this piecework done. It is simply a gratuity. The office force is perfectly capable of doing it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not care what you do about it. I have simply tried to put before you the facts.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Washington a question. My understanding is that you are not opposed to the publication of the Almanac itself?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I am not opposed. I said it is a very necessary work. As I understand, it is of value in navigation. That is one of the reasons why I am interested in it. My criticism is not that at all, but my criticism is this, that according to this report which is made it seems that there can be absolutely no doubt that the present force in the Nautical Almanac Office, the 10 regular people employed there, can do this work. Seven do it over in England, and according to the statements here the present force in our office can prepare and do that work and have half of their time left for original investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington this question. He discussed it for 10 or 15 minutes, and then he winds up by saying that it makes no difference.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not to me personally.

Mr. ADAIR. You are a taxpayer and interested in economy, are you not? Why do you make a 15-minute argument against this and then say it makes no difference to you what is done?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think I have performed my duty. I have called attention to the fact, and, as I said a while ago, I think that for several years this has been a useless expenditure. I went to the Secretary of the Navy and called his attention to it a year or two ago, and told him the whole thing ought to be wiped out.

Mr. ADAIR. You are interested in having it wiped out?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. As any other Member of Congress.

Mr. ADAIR. You are a taxpayer and interested in economy?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The tax part would not interest me.

Mr. ADAIR. You should not take the time of the House if it makes no difference to you or the public.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MOORE. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Washington stated a moment ago that some of this piecework had been farmed out, so that the appropriation for it was \$600, I believe he said, for which the party of the first part got \$600 and sublet it to some one who did the work for \$200. Did he investigate that, and does he know personally about it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I got that information when I had the matter up with the department some time ago, and I have no reason to doubt the correctness of it. As I remember, this was mentioned at the time I talked with Capt. Jayne, in the presence of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, about three years ago. If my memory is not at fault after three years, the gentleman's name was Ross—one of the very ones they wanted to put permanently on the roll, according to the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON]—that farmed out some of this piecework.

Mr. LANGLEY. You mean he was the one who got the \$600?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and hired his brother to do the work for about \$200.

Mr. LANGLEY. And hired his brother to do it for \$200?

Mr. MOORE. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, why would it not be the proper thing under the circumstances not to adopt the amendment, but leave it to stand as reported. It undoubtedly would be increased in the Senate, and then the committee would have an opportunity to make any necessary investigation for action in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that when we had the bill under consideration before the subcommittee, there being no change in the estimate except that he asked for two statutory offices, we took no testimony. We did not give the two officers they asked for on the statutory roll, but we did reduce the lump sum \$4,000. Two days ago gentlemen from the Naval Observatory came down and explained to me that we had crippled them to such an extent that they could not carry on their work; that this appropriation was more necessary now than at any time in the past, because they are obliged to use some of this lump-sum appropriation to get information that heretofore they have gotten free through exchange arrangements.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but of course there is no criticism of the gentleman or the committee for not having made an investigation of the matter. Of course the committee does not investigate every question every year, but there has been a rather exhaustive report submitted, which has not been called to the attention of the committee, which they would have an opportunity to examine. Why would it not be desirable to let it go into conference and let the committee have the chance? I am willing to take the judgment of the committee on it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to read to the gentleman from the hearings taken a year ago on this matter, and which were reaffirmed this year. Capt. Jayne was called before the committee. He was at that time at the head of this observatory. The gentleman knows Capt. Jayne and knows his interest in astronomy, and I take it there has never been a head of that bureau who has had a more distinguished service in that work, with the single exception of that distinguished and renowned Tennessean, Matthew Fontaine Maury, who, by reason of his splendid services, will live in history. He was asked by Mr. JOHNSON, chairman of the subcommittee, the following questions:

Is the expense of getting out that book so nearly uniform that for 10 years there would hardly be a variation of a dollar in the appropriation?

Capt. JAYNE. It is done under that appropriation and the appropriation for miscellaneous computations. We use that appropriation for investigation work of a very high character, which is appreciated very highly by astronomers throughout the country.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you referring to the appropriation of \$5,000 for miscellaneous computations that we have just passed?

Capt. JAYNE. No, sir; I am speaking of the appropriation under the Nautical Almanac Office.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you referring to the appropriation of \$7,000?

Capt. JAYNE. Yes, sir; we use all of that appropriation in the work of getting out the almanac and the work that is related to it of a scientific nature, such as the table of the moon by Newcombe, which are considered the finest things of the kind in the world.

Now, the amendment, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], simply proposes to restore the appropriation as it has been carried for the past 8 or 10 years. It does not add a dollar to the appropriation heretofore made.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Capt. Jayne says the amount is absolutely necessary, and it is for that reason that the gentleman from South Carolina offers the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I understand. But since that time the Secretary of the Navy has made a report to Congress of information relating to this office, and in that report, as stated by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], is the statement that this work is not required in order to get out the Ephemeris and the Nautical Almanac, which I think every one wants to have issued and properly prepared. Why not let the Senate committee have an opportunity to examine it and consider that information, which has never been presented to the committee before?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I say, it is simply proposed to restore the present appropriation. After all, this will go to the Senate, and the Senator from Washington, Mr. JONES, is an able Member of that body. He has the report, which was prepared at his instance, and he can take it before the committee, and they can thrash it out there.

Mr. MANN. These matters are disposed of in conference, and the details of this matter can be gone into by the House conferees when the conference takes place. The Senate committee makes very little investigation of these matters. Of course, if the gentleman wants to avoid that responsibility, I shall not insist.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman does an injustice to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. It has been my observation in the last year or two that they give these matters more attention than the gentleman seems to think.

Mr. MANN. Well, it has been my observation for 18 years that they do very little investigating.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is it not a fact that last year the Senate struck out this item, and that it was reinserted at the instance of the House conferees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not recall, I am frank to say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the chairman of this committee a question for information. You have reduced it, according to the statement made by yourself and other members of the committee, from \$7,000 last year to \$3,000 this year. Will you kindly tell the committee why you have made that reduction? As business men, legislating for this work, we should know. Now you are offering an amendment for \$7,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They asked in the estimates only for the lump sum of \$3,000 to be appropriated.

Mr. GOULDEN. Then why not stick to it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Hold on. In the preceding paragraph of the bill, in another place in the bill, they have asked for \$4,000 more.

Mr. GOULDEN. Did you grant it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. So that when we refused to give them the two men they asked for in another part of the bill it made it impossible, they say, to do the work on the lump sum of \$3,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], based upon a report which seems to me a very recent one, made to a distinguished Senator, I certainly hope the committee will accept the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], because I shall vote against the amendment to increase the item as unnecessary and not in the interest of the service.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, one moment. If the reports that are before the House show—and I do not know whether they do or not—that the work of getting out this almanac can be done by the men who are on the statutory pay roll in this office without any additional appropriation for piecework, it ought to be done that way, and there is not any reason on earth why we should add to the \$3,000 that is appropriated for piecework if there is any record anywhere to show that it is not needed.

Now, if the committee can postpone the amendment suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina until they can ascertain the truth of the statement made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], based upon these reports, it may be possible not only to save the \$4,000 which they propose to add, but the \$3,000 also which is reported in the bill; and it seems to me that that is the best way to look at this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For stationery, furniture, newspapers, plans, drawings, drawing materials, horses and wagons to be used only for official purposes, maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn, passenger-carrying vehicles, street car tickets not exceeding \$250, freight, expressage, postage, typewriters and computing machines and exchange of same, and other absolutely necessary expenses of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, \$40,000; it shall not be lawful to expend, for any of the offices or bureaus of the Navy Department at Washington, any sum out of appropriations made for the Naval Establishment for any of the purposes mentioned or authorized in this paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 88, in line 14, after the word "purposes," insert the word "purchase."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Indian Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; second assistant commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$2,750; forester, \$3,000; financial clerk, \$2,250; chiefs of divisions—1 \$2,250, 1 \$2,000; law clerk, \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; expert accountant, \$2,000; private secretary, \$1,800; examiner of irrigation accounts, \$1,800; draftsmen—1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,200; clerks—20 of class 4, 31 of class 3, 38 of class 2, 2 at \$1,500 each, 68 of class 1 (including 1 stenographer), 32 at \$1,000 each (including 1 stenographer), 34 at \$900 each, 2 at \$720 each; messenger; 4 assistant messengers; 4 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$325,550.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the following, on page 93, line 24: "Second assistant commissioner, who shall perform the duties of." There is no law, Mr. Chairman, organic law or any other law, except the appropriation bill of 1910, that authorizes any such office.

I do not make the point of order upon the words "chief clerk at \$2,700." There was a law which provided a chief clerk, and the act of last year provides that the salaries fixed for offices established by law should be the salary; but the act, which I will read, does not provide that the offices shall be the same as those contained therein. I will read to the Chair. The legislative act approved July 16, 1914, contains this provision:

That all laws or parts of laws to the extent they are inconsistent with rates of salaries or compensation appropriated by this act are repealed, and the rates of salaries or compensation of officers or employees herein appropriated shall constitute the rate of salary or compensation of such officers or employees, respectively, until otherwise fixed by annual rate of appropriation or other law.

To obviate the difficulty that the House then had, because of points of order made with reference to salaries which had been in existence, some of them for 30 years or more, the Congress, upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], at the end of the conference report upon this bill last year, passed this last section in the act of 1914. Has the Chair that section before him?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the appropriation act before him.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is the last section in the bill. So it will appear that while the House—I do not know whether wisely or unwisely—did say that the salaries fixed by that bill for the offices contained in the bill should be the rate of compensation or salaries of officers or employees therein appropriated for, and whereas that constituted the rate for offices now authorized by law, and the salaries fixed in the act for 1914 could not be attacked on the ground that they were not the salaries in the organic law, the act did not undertake to say that the offices contained in the bill should thus be recognized as being fixed by law. I do not think my colleagues will dispute that what I state with reference to the law was correct.

Up to 1910, Mr. Chairman, the offices in the Indian Bureau were a commissioner, an assistant commissioner, and a chief clerk, under the organic law. I hope if I make any misstatement with reference to this I will be corrected by my friends on the committee or by anyone else. In 1910 the legislative appropriation act for the first time, and the only place where it was contained up to that time, inserted these words:

Indian Office: Commissioner of Indian Affairs, \$5,000; assistant commissioner, \$3,000; second assistant commissioner, who shall perform the duties of chief clerk, \$2,250.

That was subsequently increased to \$2,750. I apprehend I need not recall to the attention of the chairman the fact that an office which for the first time is carried in an appropriation bill, even though thereafter appropriated for, does not become

an office authorized by law so as to escape being subject to the point of order that it is not existing law and that it can not be appropriated for. If the Chair has any doubt upon that proposition, I will undertake to supply him with authority upon it. That is, no matter how long or how often you appropriate for an office in an appropriation bill, without using the words "hereafter" or "there shall be established" in such a division or department a particular office, the mere appropriation of money for an office created by an annual appropriation bill does not make that permanent law.

Up to 1910, therefore, we had nothing, either in the organic act or in any appropriation bill, which made this a permanent office; and in 1910 we had for the first time in an appropriation act a provision for a—

Second assistant commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$2,250.

So that the authority to appropriate for this office at all is not to be found in the organic law establishing the Indian Bureau, nor is it to be found in any statute establishing or creating the office of second assistant commissioner. It is only to be found in the legislative appropriation act, which at no time undertook to make it a permanent office. So that since 1910 it has simply been carried in the annual appropriation bill. True, the salary can not now be attacked as not being fixed by law, although it is far above the salary fixed in the statute.

I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that that office of second assistant commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$2,750, is not authorized by law. I do not undertake to make a point of order against the chief clerk, but simply against the "second assistant commissioner, who shall perform the duties of." That is a new office; there are new duties to be performed, and there is no authority of law existing anywhere except in the annual appropriation bills to justify the appropriation.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that a bureau whose duties ought to be diminishing ought not to have a useless office, created, I apprehend, not so much for the duties necessary to be performed as for the purpose of creating an office for some one. I make no such charge as that, but it looks that way. As we have increased the salary of this man since 1910 from \$2,250 to \$2,750, let them go back to the original organic law, and if we are to appropriate money, let us not appropriate it for useless offices and for extravagant salaries. If the Chair is in doubt about that proposition that this is not permanent law, because carried in an appropriation bill without any terms that fix it as permanent law, I hope he will give me an opportunity to present the authorities upon that subject. However, I do not think anyone will dispute that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia make the point of order upon the words "second assistant commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of"?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order on the remainder of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order on the entire clause.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We have no desire to contest the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I wish to contest the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am disposed to make the point of order on all of it, but I was afraid I was going to run up against this proposition in reference to the amount of the salary having been carried heretofore in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. If any portion of the clause is subject to a point of order, the entire clause is subject to it.

There is no doubt whatever that under the law and the rules existing prior to the passage of the legislative act of last year the mere carrying of an office in an appropriation bill was not to be considered as permanent law to authorize it to be inserted in an ensuing appropriation bill; and I take it to be true—I think the gentleman so asserted, and his assertion is good—that there is no permanent law in the form of an enactment providing for a second assistant commissioner in the Indian Office. That is also true, I believe, of the various financial clerks, of various chiefs of division, law clerk, of assistant chief of division, expert accountant, private secretary, examiner of irrigation accounts, draftsmen, and various other officials, and I shall make the point of order on all of them if this is sustained.

Let us find out where we are at. Last year, because of the fact that most of the items in the legislative bill were subject to a point of order, and because of the fact that it is practically impossible in one year to name all the officers in the different departments of the Government for permanent employment without there being an opportunity to increase the number next year, because most of the places named in the legislative act

were subject to a point of order under the rules as heretofore construed, Congress provided in the legislative act in section 6, which my friend from Georgia has already quoted, as follows:

That all laws or parts of laws to the extent they are inconsistent with rates of salaries or compensation appropriated by this act are repealed, and the rates of salaries or compensation of officers or employees herein appropriated shall constitute the rate of salary or compensation of such officers or employees, respectively, until otherwise fixed by annual rate of appropriation or other law.

The Chair is called upon now to make a very important ruling, and the question is whether where Congress fixes a salary for an office it thereby authorizes the office itself. That is the only question involved here.

Suppose we should pass a law directly providing that hereafter the salary of the Second Assistant Commissioner of Patents shall be \$2,750. The law itself only provides directly for the fixing of the salary, does it also authorize the office? Is it to be said that where Congress directly fixes the salary of a particular office, it does not warrant the office itself? I contend, Mr. Chairman, that by this provision of the law where Congress says that the rate of salary provided for a certain office shall be the rate hereafter, that they thereby provide for the office itself and make that permanent law until it shall be changed either by permanent legislation or by the annual appropriation bill; that if we leave it out of the annual appropriation bill, that office would be abolished; and that when we provide for an office and fix a salary for the office we authorize the office itself. That was the design of this amendment, that was the design of that provision in the legislative bill of last year. Without it we are not much better off under the rules of the House than we were before. The Chair will remember that last year paragraph after paragraph providing for whole offices went out of the bill on a point of order in the House. It was subsequently restored by unanimous consent, and the very purpose of section 6 of the legislative act of last year was to give the House control over these appropriations. When we provide for an office this year and fix the salary for that office, that item is in order next year under the rules of the House. Of course, it might have been made plainer. I appreciate that. But it could not have been made plainer without fixing it as permanent law, which could not be dropped out.

Now, if we fail to make an appropriation for an office, the officer can not bring a claim in the Court of Claims. If we specifically provided by legislation for the office of Second Assistant Commissioner of Patents at \$2,750 a year and failed to make the appropriation, the Second Assistant Commissioner of Patents could bring a suit in the Court of Claims, and we would have to pay the salary. This section 6 was carefully prepared, and it gives to the House the right this year to treat as permanent law any office the salary of which was fixed in the legislative bill of last year. But if we drop it out this year, it does not give the officer any chance to make a claim in the Court of Claims.

If the Chair holds that while we fix the salary for the office we do not authorize the office, the legislative bill becomes the whim of any one Member of the House. You can not provide by law that there shall be so many clerks, so many other officials, so many law clerks, so many private secretaries, so many chiefs of division, as permanent law without tying the hands of the House, which primarily makes the appropriation for the departments in Washington. I hope the Chair will overrule the point of order made by myself, as well as the point of order made by my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair remembers distinctly when this matter was before the House in reference to the points of order made against increase of salaries on appropriation bills above that fixed by law. The Chair thinks and believes that it was the intention of Congress that the salary of all offices which were provided for by law and which were authorized to be provided for in appropriation bills should be permanently fixed according to the appropriation bill of 1914 of last year.

Now, the Chair does not take it that Congress intended in that provision to authorize all offices not provided by law, but only to fix the salaries of those offices which were provided by law according to section 6 of the act of July 16, 1914, and that the contention of the gentleman from Illinois that that provision made permanent all offices provided for in the last year's appropriation bill was not the intention of Congress, and the provision in the law did only apply to salaries and not to the offices not provided by law, and so the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. On both points of order?

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia and on the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the provisions for a forester at \$3,000; financial clerk, \$2,250; chiefs of divisions—1 \$2,250, 1 \$2,000; law clerk, \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; expert accountant, \$2,000; private secretary, \$1,800; examiner of irrigation accounts, \$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Illinois inform the Chair whether or not the act establishing the Indian Office provided for these offices?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is the rule of the House that it is the duty of the gentlemen in charge of the bill, or the one proposing the proposition, to submit authority of law. I do not think there is any authority of law for these places.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, there is no statute creating those places. It is subject to a point of order. I hope that the gentleman from Illinois will not make the point of order. It is a part of the force and has been organized for years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina:
Page 94, line 11, strike out "\$325,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, one moment. That amendment which I sent to the desk was to correct the total if the Chair sustained the point of order in respect to the \$2,750 item. If the gentleman from Illinois insists upon his point of order, we will have to still further correct the total.

Mr. MANN. I have made the point of order and it has been sustained.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the total may be corrected by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the total.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand this proceeding, the position of second assistant Indian commissioner has been stricken out of the bill. To my certain knowledge the gentleman occupying the position of second assistant Indian commissioner has done a great proportion of the routine work in that office for a great many years. Commissioners may come and go and assistant commissioners may come and go, of whatever party, each doing everything that he can for our Indian people. Representing as I do a district which has 19 tribes of Indians in it, I know the detail work necessary in attempting to look after the many individual complaints and troubles of the Indians is enormous. Take away the office of second assistant commissioner and the result will be to greatly overload the Indian Commissioner and his assistant—both men of undoubted ability. Why, Mr. Chairman, even the matter of the payment for a coffin, to give a dead Indian a modern burial, frequently has to be decided by an official as high in authority as a second assistant Indian commissioner, involving oft a long routine.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is simply another effort to economize at the wrong end, and in the wrong way. This is a necessary office.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet I desire to say that when the committee reaches page 104, where provision is made for the Post Office Department, I shall call attention to the fact that on several western Washington star routes, newly organized on a new pay system the 1st of July, the contractors have not as yet, after five months' hard service, received a cent of pay. What system prevails in the Post Office Department that permits this? In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, each one of those star-route carriers has received three letters from a firm of lawyers in this city offering to make those collections.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to intimate that there has been some jockeying with the bookkeeping and finances of the postal department in order to show a surplus?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, I would not intimate that, or any other intimation, but I do insist it is time that those star-route carriers who haul mail by the ton over the slippery rocks of the North Pacific coast, or along the hard puncheon roads in the forest reserves, should receive their pay. I hope that the long-delayed vouchers can be sent to them this very day, so that they may be received in time for Christmas.

Mr. MONDELL. Can the gentleman inform us how these attorneys came to know that these men were not paid?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have made efforts to find that out. One high official thinks that the names get out through the supplying of lists to prospective bondsmen. Another thinks the index cards get out of the case and fail to get back. Whatever the cause of the delay, it does seem a pity when times are hard out West, when interest on money is 8 and 10 per cent, that men who bid down to the very bone to get these contracts can not get their money.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON]. I agree with all that the gentleman from Washington has said with regard to the duties of the second assistant Indian commissioner, and also in respect to the splendid services of the very efficient man who has for years filled that office. The gentleman from Washington, I think, misunderstands or misinterprets what has just occurred. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] does not seem to be on duty. For some unknown reason he is absent, and is not making his usual points of order. It is necessary in the consideration of one of these appropriation bills that some parliamentary sharp shall call attention to the possibilities which the bill contains. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] having failed at this crucial moment, others come to the rescue. Of course it does not really mean anything. I want to assure the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] that these items will all be cared for and provided for, and when the bill is signed the bill will contain all these items in exactly the same form in which they appear in the bill, possibly in greater amount—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). But it is necessary that someone somewhere develop the possibilities of the bill in regard to points of order, and I am glad we have not lost the valuable services of gentlemen who are capable of doing that sort of thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Can the gentleman guarantee that the rural-route carriers of far-western Washington will receive their six months' pay in time for Christmas?

Mr. MONDELL. I regret I can not guarantee that the Post Office Department will pay adequate attention to the star-route service. My experience is that they are too busy cutting down expenditures and providing for apparent surpluses to take as good care as they should of people who live out in the sparsely settled portions of the country who are served by star routes; but I do want to assure the gentleman in regard to these items that they will all be back in the bill in due and proper form, and in the meantime we have had an illustration of the fact that, in spite of the amendment adopted last year, there are still splendid and numerous opportunities to make points of order on the items in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by placing therein one or more letters from lawyers to star-route carriers in reference to the collection of their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to place in the Record certain letters, as indicated by him. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1916 not more than 25 per cent of the vacancies occurring in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions hereinabove provided for shall be filled except by promotion or demotion from among those in the classified service in said bureau. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I read in the newspapers the other day, I think, a statement by the Commissioner of Pensions that there had been such a reduction in his office that he would not be able to keep up with the current business. Is that a correct statement of the facts?

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman make that statement again?

Mr. MANN. I read in the newspapers the other day a statement attributed to the Commissioner of Pensions that owing to the reduction of the force in his office he would not be able to keep up with the current business.

Mr. BARTLETT. Just the contrary of that is true, according to his report.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers have made some very extravagant statements about the reductions made in the Pension Office. They were absolutely without foundation—

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman if the Commissioner of Pensions is satisfied with the reductions which have been

made and with the reduction which would be caused by this paragraph?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. In answer to the gentleman I want to state that not only as to this bill but in the bill for the current year we gave the Commissioner of Pensions just exactly the number of people he asked for.

Mr. MANN. I know that; but the current year also provides that where vacancies occur that not more than 25 per cent of them shall be filled. Now, it would depend upon the number of vacancies. I am not referring to the number of people appropriated for, but whether that provision that only 25 per cent of the vacancies which occur shall be filled has crippled the office.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, I think not. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the force is very much larger than the work requires, but for reasons of humanity, which the gentleman will understand as well as I do, we are reducing this force not as radically as we might, but about as vacancies occur.

Mr. MANN. Well, did the Commissioner of Pensions make any protest against this proviso?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, he wanted those places left open for the purpose of administration, that is all.

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman mean by "purposes of administration"?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Well, he claimed that he should be allowed to fill more of these lower places. That was the statement made.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is satisfied, however, that the continuation of this will not cripple the office?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. The commissioner asked for 83 reductions.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just in order to say a word, because I made a statement to my friend the gentleman from Illinois, and I think it is proper that I should verify it.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will examine the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, on pages 6 and 8, he will find that he treats the subject of saving and economy in the Pension Bureau over which he has charge and the reduction of force, and gives a statement of why it is done. First, that the abolition of these pension agencies and the inauguration of the new system of pay by check in place of vouchers has saved the Government \$146,261 per annum, and that they have been able by that to reduce the force, and I make this statement because on yesterday the Commissioner of Pensions was before the subcommittee having the preparation of the pension appropriation bill in charge, and he there repeated the statement that he had been before the subcommittee which had charge of the preparation of this bill, saying they had given him everything that he asked for and that it was absolutely all that was necessary.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will my friend from Georgia yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOULDEN. The Commissioner of Pensions is entirely satisfied that he is able to conduct the affairs of his office satisfactorily and without any decrease in efficiency?

Mr. BARTLETT. Absolutely—

Mr. GOULDEN. That is all I desire to know.

Mr. BARTLETT (continuing). And if the gentleman will read the report, he will find that the commissioner has got all he asked for and all that he can reasonably expect to expend.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; first assistant commissioner, \$4,500; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk (who shall be qualified to act as principal examiner), \$3,000; 4 law examiners, at \$2,750 each; 3 examiners in chief, at \$3,500 each; examiner of interferences, \$2,700; examiners of trade-marks and designs—1 \$2,700, first assistant \$2,400, 6 assistants at \$1,500 each; examiners—one of classification \$3,600, 43 principals at \$2,700 each, 63 first assistants at \$2,400 each, 73 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 88 third assistants at \$1,800 each, 110 fourth assistants at \$1,500 each; financial clerk, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; 3 assistant chiefs of divisions, at \$1,800 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the commissioner, \$1,800; translator of languages, \$1,800; clerks—9 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 130 of class 1, 90 at \$1,000 each; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; messenger and property clerk, \$1,000; 90 copyists; 50 copyists, at \$720 each; 4 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; laborers—14 at \$600 each, 42 at \$540 each; 40 messenger boys, at \$420 each; in all, \$1,322,800.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph carrying the Patent Office. A large number of these places are not provided for by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. What is the item?

Mr. MANN. The whole paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. You want to make a point of order against it?

Mr. MANN. Yes. I want to show the absurdity of the contention that you make.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from Illinois shown that these places are not provided for by law?

Mr. MANN. There is no way of showing the negative. The gentleman from Wyoming ought to have learned before this that when you prove a thing you prove the positive and not the negative. Unless the Chair desires me to read all the Revised Statutes and the Statutes at Large clear through, there will be no other way of demonstrating there is no law on the subject.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has not claimed that these places are not provided for by law other than by making the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I made the statement that a large number of them were provided for by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Of course, the gentleman knows that if there are places in this paragraph not provided for by law it is fatal to the whole paragraph. And, I tell you, that a number of these places have been carried in the appropriation bill year by year and not provided for by law. Most of them have been created by the administrative officers of the bureau.

Mr. MANN. I think they ought to be carried by law. Of course, I do not think the sustaining of the point of order will take them out of the bill in the end. I think if the law passed last year was not sufficient, we ought to pass one that makes these items in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We were dealing with salaries last year.

Mr. MANN. We were dealing with places. Last year the point of order was made against the places, and they went out of the bill, and it was for the purpose of correcting that that section 6 was put in the bill. I am not going to quarrel with the ruling. I just exercise my privilege under that ruling.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The gentleman made the point of order and got a ruling in accordance with his suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman say that the items are subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. There are items in there that are not provided for by law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Education: Commissioner, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; specialist in higher education, \$3,000; editor, \$2,000; statistician, \$1,800; specialist in charge of land-grant college statistics, \$1,800; 2 translators, at \$1,800 each; collector and compiler of statistics, \$2,400; specialists—1 in foreign educational systems and 1 in educational systems, at \$1,800 each; clerks—4 of class 4; 4 of class 3; 5 of class 2; 8 of class 1; 7 at \$1,000 each; 3 copyists; copyists—2 at \$800 each; 1, \$720; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; messenger; assistant messenger; laborers—3 at \$480 each; 1, \$400; in all, \$75,200.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph. It contains various places not provided for by existing law, and hence contrary to the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. It is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation of rural education and industrial education, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and no salary shall be paid hereunder in excess of \$3,500 per annum, \$30,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from South Carolina explain what is proposed to be done by the expenditure of this \$30,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes, sir. They are spending \$30,000 in making investigation of rural and industrial education, a small part of it being used in the District of Columbia for clerical services.

Mr. MOORE. Is this new work?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, no. This work was begun several years ago. This is not a new item in the bill at all. This is the current law. There is no change.

Mr. MOORE. I notice that later on in the bill—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that the item was put in on the floor of the House after a full debate two or three years ago.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman explain in a word of just what this investigation consists?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. No; I can not. As I stated to the gentleman, this appropriation was begun by action

of the House itself. It was inaugurated on a small scale, and the House increased it two or three years ago.

Mr. MOORE. We have provided for certain lines of agricultural education in the Lever-Smith bill. Later on we propose to have a census of agriculture, which in a way will be educational; and I would like to know if the gentleman can tell just how this money is apportioned and what results are acquired as the result of the investigation?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I can not answer that question.

Mr. MOORE. And yet the appropriation has been regularly made heretofore. Is it for the purpose of imparting information to schools and colleges, for instance?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes, sir; they have experts who travel and confer with and cooperate with the schools of the country.

Mr. MOORE. Industrial education is spoken of here. Does that mean an examination of manual-training schools?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes; they send people to these industrial centers, and they confer with those who are in charge of industrial schools and give them such information as they can and such suggestions as they are able to give in regard to their methods and the improvement of their methods.

Mr. MOORE. That is to say, the National Bureau of Education, through this investigation and by these visitations, aids in disseminating information to rural schools and industrial schools?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes, sir; that is the purpose of the appropriation, and that is the way they claim it is expended.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the nature of the reports that are printed in regard to this investigation? Is he familiar with the printed reports with reference to it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. He makes a report every year covering the entire operations and activities of the Bureau of Education, not only this particular item but all other activities of his bureau. I think the gentleman will find the reports interesting reading.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman regards this as necessary work, does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Well, Congress thought so.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. In this behalf is it not true that the Bureau of Education during the last year has employed two or three of the leading educators of the United States, especially versed in rural education, and do they not travel through various parts of the United States gathering such information as they can and cooperating with the rural teaching forces of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I am satisfied that is true.

Mr. SLOAN. I happen to know one or two of the people so employed, and I know them to be persons eminently qualified to do this kind of work from the results following.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman explain what it is that they do? That is what I am trying to get at. It is easy to say they travel and visit these schools.

Mr. SLOAN. The rural schools, I will say to the gentleman from Philadelphia, are country schools in the rural communities, and not schools in the metropolitan parts of the country.

Mr. MOORE. Of course I understood that very well, and, knowing the characteristics of the section of the country the gentleman comes from, I would assume he was versed in those matters.

Mr. BRYAN. How would the gentleman know he comes from that part of the country?

Mr. MOORE. By looking at him. [Laughter.] But the gentleman from Nebraska has not answered my question.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has not given me an opportunity. If the gentleman will give me time, I will proceed. I may say I obtained my time from the chairman, and if the gentleman will indorse the chairman's action, I will proceed. [Laughter.] In numerous States there are highly developed specialists in particular lines of education, and they are all interested in rural education. So is the National Bureau of Education. These activities are based upon and grew out of the movement on the part of various civic organizations throughout the country known as the "back to the land movement." There is a movement "back to the soil" for the purpose of popularizing country life. Part of country life, of course, is its educational system. The various States of the Union through their educational authorities have worked up excellent systems of rural schools. Some of them have special merit. Some of them develop special features.

It was thought by the educational forces of the country, as I understand it, that the cooperation of the Federal Government with these various educators in all the States, bringing to bear what is found to be good in each of the States and what is found to be good by the national educational authorities, can not help, when coordinated and published to the world, accompanied by the advice given by these experts who have given their life work to rural or industrial education who are now in the employ of the Government, to work out good for the general development of these educational systems throughout the country. The best in each State is sought to be brought into other States; and the best obtained by the bureau from foreign countries to be disseminated among the States.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Suppose a school in the gentleman's district desired to have one of these specialists and desired to benefit from these investigations. How would they go about it? Would they communicate with the Commissioner of Education and ask him to send to them one of these specialists?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes. That is the method. It is designed to bring about a cooperation with the rural and industrial educational authorities. It is not limited to the rural school systems. It extends also to industrial systems. The bureau has an industrial specialist. This appropriation provides for a specialist on school building and sanitation, one on administration, one on courses of study, one for primary work, and one for domestic science.

Mr. MOORE. I am very much interested in industrial education, and that is the reason why I asked the question whether the services of these trained men would be available to cities as well as to the country.

Mr. SLOAN. That is my information, and the text of this paragraph would also indicate it. Nor are the villages neglected in this general plan.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has thrown more light on the subject than the members of the committee have done, and I should like to ask him whether, in his judgment, this appropriation should continue, and whether those services are really worth the price we pay for them?

Mr. SLOAN. I can assure the gentleman they are well worth it. They are one of the most helpful features of rural education in the United States. The appropriation should be continued, and as this work goes on future Congressmen will gladly vote more liberal appropriations for this, one of the best and most salutary educational enterprises.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word. If the gentleman from the great city of Philadelphia had had the time to look over the hearings which were held by the subcommittee having under consideration the preparation of this bill a year ago he would have found a very full and elaborate explanation on the part of the very able and efficient Commissioner of Education as to exactly what was being done and what was expected to be done by the Bureau of Education under this appropriation. I do not care to take up the time of the committee to read it, unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania or some other member of the committee desires it, but if the gentleman wants the information he can find it on pages 458 and 459 of those hearings. I am going to ask permission to insert those pages in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. MOORE. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that statement in these very voluminous hearings, and I shall be obliged to him if he will put it in the RECORD, because I think it is very valuable information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In explaining how the particular appropriation asked for a year ago was to be used and what it was expected to accomplish, the commissioner said:

The four specialists in rural education that this bureau now has can do only a small fraction of the work needed in this division. They can not respond to one-fourth of the requests from State, county, and local school officials for information, advice, and assistance. The additional amount asked for will enable the bureau to respond to the more important and urgent of these demands. There are in the United States about 250,000 rural-school teachers and approximately 10,000,000 rural-school pupils. The work of these schools is badly planned, poorly organized, and ineffectively done. With an adequate force of rural-school specialists, this bureau could give much valuable help. Investigations and reports should be made immediately on rural-school consolidation, increase in length of school term, supervision, and the better adaptation of the courses of study to the needs of rural communities.

Of this increase, \$31,700 will be needed for the investigation and promotion of industrial education. The most important demand on our schools and our systems of education is for such extension and readjustment as will enable them to give the industrial and vocational education needed and demanded by modern industrial life. Many requests come to this bureau for information and help which it is unable to give. There is need for a careful and fundamental study of the problems involved. This bureau is the proper agency for such study. The amount estimated will enable the bureau to make the study and to give the help needed when requested. If this appropriation is made, the chief specialist mentioned in the note should serve as the head of the division, and, with his assistant, should give his immediate attention to the problems of trade schools and vocational education in the city schools. The three remaining specialists mentioned in the note and their assistants should be assigned to the investigation and promotion of agricultural education in secondary schools, education in home economics, and commercial education.

Of this increase, \$9,800 will be needed for the investigation and promotion of school hygiene and sanitation. The health of the children is an important interest to the Nation. The establishment of health is the first principle in education. Every community is interested in the proper structure and sanitation of schoolhouses and in the hygienic conduct of its schools. Hundreds of requests come to the sanitation and hygiene division of this bureau for information, advice, and direction which it is unable to give. Part-time service of one special agent is wholly inadequate. The sum estimated will enable the bureau to give much valuable help. Of the two specialists mentioned in the note, one should be an expert in school architecture and sanitation, and one should be a physician with sufficient medical knowledge to give expert advice in regard to the medical inspection of children in the schools and other means of preserving the health of children.

I merely desire to say, in addition to what the commissioner has so well and forcibly said, that this is a very valuable work. The appropriation is abundantly justified by the work which the commissioner and his able corps of assistants are performing. I for one have felt that it would have been advisable to have granted a slight increase in behalf of rural and industrial education. Certainly the current appropriation should be continued.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds: Superintendent, \$6,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; chief electrical engineer, \$3,000; civil engineer, \$2,400; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,200 each; compensation to disbursing clerk, \$1,000; messenger; person in charge of the heating of the Supreme Court and central portion of the Capitol, \$1,000; laborer in charge of water-closets in central portion of the Capitol, \$660; 7 laborers for cleaning Rotunda, corridors, Dome, and old library portion of Capitol, at \$660 each; 2 laborers in charge of public closets of the House of Representatives and in the terrace, at \$720 each; bookkeeper and accountant, \$2,200; in all, \$29,960.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRYAN. The brief remarks I desire to make, perhaps, ought to be made under "Public buildings and grounds" rather than under the "Capitol Building and Grounds," but I will consume but a very little time, and I hope there will be no objection, even though it is slightly out of order.

A committee of workmen employed in the public parks, consisting of L. E. McGowan, J. F. Essig, and H. S. Reese, called on me the other day and presented to me a copy of a letter that had been written to the Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and stated that Mr. FITZGERALD had sent them to me. I did not understand why he sent them to me, unless he was perhaps somewhat facetious; but a little later they showed to me in conversation the names of those to whom Mr. FITZGERALD had referred them, and among them was the name of Congressman J. W. BYRNS, rather than my own name. Nevertheless they left a letter with me, and I am going to place it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and call attention to the matter which they presented.

These workmen showed that President Wilson, according to newspaper reports, had taken up the question of trying to get an increase of wages for the laborers working under the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, and that he asked Secretary Tumulty to take up the matter with Chairman FITZGERALD, of the House, with a view to increasing the pay of these men.

The communication shows that they receive \$1.60 a day, and that they are paid every 30 days; that they have no chance of promotion; that they are laid off in bad weather; and that they would like an increase to \$2 per day and would like to be paid twice a month, as workmen are paid in other departments. The letter shows a scale of wages in other cities; for instance, New York, \$2.50 a day, paid weekly; Richmond, Va., \$2.25, paid twice monthly; Baltimore, Md., \$2.50 per day, paid weekly; Chicago, Ill., \$2.25 a day, paid twice a month. It is shown that the Government departments, except this office of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, pay better wages and pay twice a month, and that these men are not receiving, according to their view and what appears to be the view of the President and others, a fair and just consideration.

I spoke to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] about the matter, and he said the appropriation was made in a lump sum, and it was up to the local officer who disbursed that money to raise their wages if he felt he could do it; and the gentleman added that he believed that the wages ought to be raised. But this committee informed the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. FITZGERALD, through their communication, that they have been to the local officer who has charge of the matter, Col. Hartz, and he has informed them that he can not do anything without an additional appropriation.

I think that matter is something that ought to be considered, and that arrangements ought to be made to give to these men more adequate consideration. One dollar and sixty cents a day certainly does not pay them for the work that they do.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Considering the present condition of the country, caused by Democratic legislation, when millions of men are now seeking a chance to earn 50 cents a day, or any other sum, does not the gentleman think that these men are lucky to have a job at all?

Mr. BRYAN. They may be lucky to have a job at all. That may be true; but that is not an economic reason for reducing the wages of those who are working. I do not believe the wages of those who are working ought to be held below an amount necessary for the sustenance of life merely because there are a good many unemployed. I do not believe that is the right solution. Of course, as the gentleman from Illinois says, they may consider themselves lucky in having a job at all; and of course the gentleman from Illinois agrees with me as to the payment of adequate wages by the Government, whether times are good or bad.

The letter I referred to follows:

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
House of Representatives.

DECEMBER 1, 1914.

Sir: We, the undersigned, park employees of the Public Buildings and Grounds, respectfully petition an increase in salaries from \$1.60 per diem to \$2 per day, and we appeal to Congress through you.

Under the existing circumstances we can not be promoted, hence we appeal to you for justice, as we are not protected by the classified civil service, but are paid from an appropriation from Congress, in which the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds pays the said employees. We also ask to be paid twice monthly, like most of the other departments.

We just recently petitioned Col. Harts, who is in charge of the public buildings and grounds, and he informed us that he can not do anything without an appropriation from Congress.

There are about 300 men in this department, the majority of whom are married and have families to support.

Following is the wage scale per day paid to park employees in several other cities: New York, \$2.50 per day, paid weekly; Richmond, Va., \$2.25 per day, paid twice monthly; Baltimore, Md., \$2.50 per day, paid weekly; and Chicago, Ill., \$2.25 per day, paid twice monthly.

This is the minimum wage scale for park employees in these cities, while in the Capital City the minimum wage scale is \$1.60 per day, and we are paid only once a month. It seems to us employees that we are unjustly discriminated against. Ours are the most beautiful parks in the world, and yet we are paid less for caring for them than any of the employees in the other cities.

We hereby submit a list of salaries paid in the different departments of Washington:

Department of the Interior: Salaries for unskilled laborers, \$480, \$540, \$600, and \$660 per annum. The payments are made twice monthly, and 30 days of both annual and sick leave of absence are allowed.

Department of Agriculture: Salaries paid to unskilled laborers, \$40 to \$70 per month, paid twice monthly; 30 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave.

National Zoological Park: Salaries paid to unskilled laborers, from \$1 to \$2.25 per day, according to age and ability and the character of the work for which they are employed. They are paid twice monthly, receive pay for legal holidays, and are allowed annual leave for not more than 30 days. Temporary laborers are allowed leave for 1 and 1½ days per month when employed 9 months.

Government Printing Office: Salaries paid to unskilled laborers are at the rate of 25 cents per hour. They are paid biweekly and are allowed 30 days annual leave of absence. No sick leave is allowed. These facts have been furnished by various chief clerks of these departments.

So we appeal to Congress for justice, and hope you will take the matter under consideration at once.

Respectfully,

L. E. MCGOWAN,
J. F. ESSIG,
H. S. REESE,
Committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. RUSSELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House concurrent resolution 55.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the two Houses adjourn December 23, 1914, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, December 29, 1914.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arizona: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$10,000; contingent expenses, \$1,500; in all, \$14,500.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The estimate for the surveyor general's office for the State of Arizona was \$17,800, \$3,000 for the surveyor general, \$13,000 for clerks, and \$1,800 for contingent expenses. The clerks' item has been reduced to \$10,000 and the contingent expenses to \$1,400. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why that reduction was made. I do not find anything in the hearings with regard to those items. I find that in nearly every case the appropriation for clerk hire and contingent expenses in the offices of the surveyors general has been reduced below the estimates. There is but one or two exceptions. Why was that done? There were no hearings on the subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes. Arizona last year had \$13,000 for clerk hire and they expended \$9,346. We give them \$10,000 in this bill, which is \$700 in excess of what they expended last year. For incidentals they spent last year \$1,418, and we give them \$1,500 in this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. But the subcommittee did not interrogate the commissioner with regard to these items, as to their necessities for the coming year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We thought what they actually expended was a pretty safe guide for what they needed.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in these cases it is not necessarily any guide at all. The necessary expenditures under these appropriations in the offices of the surveyors general depend entirely upon the amount and extent of the surveys. The department knows to what extent the surveys have progressed, and the department estimates with a view of giving the surveyors general a sufficient force to work up the pending surveys. If that is not done, these surveys will in a short time get far behind. There are some of the States now where the surveyor general's office is several years behind in its examination of surveys. The gentleman will recall that last year the suggestion was made by the department that these appropriations for clerks and for contingent expenses should be in a lump sum, in order that they might be transferred from one office to another. The committee did not see fit to do that. I think it should have been done, but the committee continues to appropriate in this way. Now, in this condition of affairs it is inevitable that there will be a surplus in some of these offices, but I do not believe the committee can safely appropriate without investigation an amount below that which the department asks for; and I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is nothing that disorganizes the Public Land Service to such an extent as delay in the offices of the surveyors general. We are not only making many original surveys, but we are making many resurveys, and during the period of those surveys the land titles in the region are tied up. No entries can be made. No final proofs can be made, and it is exceedingly important that these surveys be worked up in the surveyor general's office promptly and sent on to the department here, so that the surveys can be accepted or rejected, as the case may be. It seems to me that without any investigation of the matter at all the subcommittee is certainly not justified in cutting down these items. Not only this one, but most of the items, including California, Colorado, Montana, and half a dozen other States, have been reduced below the estimate without any investigation by the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 102, line 11, by striking out the figures "\$10,000" and inserting the figures "\$13,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 102, line 11, strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert "\$13,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that it has always been difficult for me to understand is why, as the public lands of the United States become less and less, so much more money is called for to administer them. This office of the surveyor general in Arizona in 1906 was able to get along with \$4,500. In 1912 this was jumped from \$8,000, the amount at which it had stood for a number of years, to \$13,000. And what is true with respect to Arizona is true with respect to all the public-land States, only some of them have had larger increases than Arizona.

The departments always ask for every possible dollar that they can spend. They want more money than they can spend.

This committee had before it the very best possible information upon which to base this bill, and that is what they actually expended last year. Last year they had just what they are asking for next year. According to their own estimates, they did not contemplate that their work would increase any over what they had to do last year, because they are asking for only \$13,000. So we base this appropriation, not only in Arizona but in all these public-land offices, on the amount they actually expended. They had \$13,000. They expended \$9,346. We give them \$10,000, or about \$700 more than they expended last year; and I hope that the Committee of the Whole will keep this amount at what the Committee on Appropriations fixed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 12, page 102, by striking out the figures "1,500" and inserting "1,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 102, line 12, strike out the figures "1,500" and insert "1,800."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They spent \$1,400 last year, and we gave them \$1,500, a little margin.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee cut this item without any knowledge or information whatever, without making any efforts to secure information as to the necessities of the service. They assume that because the service last year used a certain amount—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Not until I have finished this sentence—they assumed that because the service last year used a certain amount that therefore two years later it will need the same amount. Well, it might need more and it might need less, as everyone knows who knows anything about the character of this service. Now I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to interrogate the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not now.

Mr. MONDELL. If the subcommittee had made any investigation into this matter, there would have been no reasonable ground for criticism. There has been no investigation. There was simply an examination of what was spent last year, with an assumption that no more will be needed and no less than was needed two years prior to the period we are appropriating for. That is as curious a theory on which to base appropriations as I ever heard of anywhere. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not care to ask any question now.

Mr. MONDELL. Very well. There are some of these States where the work of the surveyor general's office is two or three years behind. This is or has been true in the State of Utah. You have not reduced the appropriation for the State of Utah, because they used all of their appropriation last year. They would have used more if they had had it. There are settlers in that State who have been waiting two or three years to get their patents because the work has not been done. What ought to be done with these items is to lump them. There is no sense in carrying items for clerk hire and contingent expenses in surveyor general's offices in separate items. It necessarily results in a surplus in some cases and a failure to perform work, by reason of lack of appropriation, in other cases. The committee has reduced the appropriation in my own State for the surveyor general's office, and yet I frequently have appeals to have the work in the surveyor general's office expedited. There is complaint of delay in the examination of surveys after the surveys have been made in the field. We have township after township entirely withdrawn from entry and where it is almost impossible to make land transfers because men do not know with regard to their survey. And yet there is a reduction here without examination, without information, simply on the theory that the office will need no more than it had two years before the time when these appropriations are to be available.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming may have some secret method by which he would obtain information on these matters other than that possessed by the committee, but I do not believe his information would be of any value, or of as much value as that which the committee had before it. For instance, in the case of which he is complaining the department last year asked that \$13,000 be appropriated for clerk hire in the surveyor general's office in Arizona. Thirteen thousand dollars was appropriated, and yet only \$9,346 was expended.

Mr. MONDELL. Is the gentleman talking about the current year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not the current year, because we have not finished the current year. No one can submit an estimate with accuracy as to just how much will be expended, and no one is able to tell with accuracy how much will be needed. Judgment must be based upon something; the committee bases its judgment upon the facts and experience of the past rather than upon fanciful imaginations concerning the future. That is a basis that is frequently adopted by gentlemen in trying to determine how much money should be appropriated for a service in which they are interested. One class of men take the record and experience of the past and arrive at a conclusion, while others try to anticipate the future and base their estimate upon what they fancy may be necessary.

In the item under consideration \$1,500 is recommended instead of \$1,800, because last year \$1,400 was the total expenditure. It may be of some value to call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming to the situation in his own State, which he criticizes. For the fiscal year 1914 the department asked \$22,300 for clerk hire, and \$20,000 was appropriated. All that was expended was \$12,365; the service could not possibly expend, within \$8,000, the amount the committee allowed.

Merely in the hope that in some way some one will devise some means to expend all the money that is appropriated is not sufficient justification to grant requests for appropriation. Then the gentleman from Wyoming must remember that his side of the House has been criticizing this administration so violently for making large appropriations that he should be one of the last to complain when some effort is made to curtail appropriations. The trouble is—and it is illustrated by the gentleman from Wyoming—everyone preaches economy, but no one is willing to have it practiced at the expense of the particular service in which he happens to be interested.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman from New York in view of what he has said will not leave the Hall, but will be here when we reach a provision in the bill where it is attempted to appropriate \$3,000,000 for a new project, an entirely useless object. He can prove himself a real economist.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am here during the consideration of this bill, and when the provision is reached to which the gentleman refers I shall be here, and I may give the gentleman the shock of his life. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But that does not alter the fact that for the recommendation in this bill there is ample justification and no excuse to increase this particular provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

California: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$10,000; contingent expenses, \$1,400; in all, \$14,400.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The estimate for California was \$16,400, and the amount appropriated for the surveyor general's office is \$14,400. There has been a reduction below the amounts estimated in practically every one of these States. I think there are only two exceptions. I do not think the committee had sufficient information upon the subject. The Land Office ought to be able to determine with a great deal of accuracy how much money they need. I will tell the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] how in the year he refers to the surveyor general's office in Wyoming failed to use its appropriation. A new surveyor general was appointed. There were two widows and an unmarried woman in the office force who had long been employed in the office, and it seems to have occurred to the new surveyor general or some one in authority that it would be a very excellent idea to deprive those good women of their jobs. One of those ladies, all of whom were efficient clerks, was the widow of a man long known in our State as an active, influential Democrat. But neither character, service, or efficiency counted, and these women, dependent upon the money that they earned in this office for a livelihood, one of them, at least, having children dependent upon her, long in the service, faithful and efficient, were discharged. Of course that left the force of the surveyor general's office reduced. It is true they did not use the entire amount of the appropriation that year. It is also true that the work of the office was not promptly taken care of, but that is not any reason why this appropriation should be cut down below the estimates without information as to the amount needed. I shall not offer amendments to the other items—Idaho, Nevada, Washington, and other States—

until I reach the item for my own State, because I realize how useless it would be.

The committee evidently has determined not to increase these items without regard to the evidence as to the necessity for an increase, and that being the case I do not desire to take up the time of the committee discussing these matters. I have, however, no sort of question but that these items will all be restored, and gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol will get the credit for providing for the public service in a proper way. Let me suggest again that this method of making these appropriations is evidently not the best method. Clerk hire and contingent expenses in the surveyor general's office should be appropriated for in a lump sum, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office should apportion it as it is needed. Of course that would not in every case please the surveyors general. It would not give them the control that they now have over their funds, but it would be in the interest of public business, because the department can estimate with reasonable accuracy the total amount needed, and it can be used where it is needed to bring this work up and make and keep it current.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wyoming: Surveyor general, \$3,000; clerks, \$12,500; contingent expenses, \$500; in all, \$16,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, on page 103, line 9, I move to strike out the figures "\$12,500" and insert "\$20,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what his record is as to the amount expended the last fiscal year in the surveyor general's office in Wyoming for clerk hire.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Twelve thousand three hundred and sixty-five dollars and thirty-four cents.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have explained to the committee why more of that clerk-hire money was not expended. I know that in Wyoming this amount is needed. I will not say the work of the surveyor general's office is badly in arrears, but it is not current, and we are making such surveys as will necessitate the use of as large a sum of money as is appropriated, if the work is to be kept current. There is no branch of the public service that is more important to our people than this matter of having surveys, after they have been executed in the field, examined in the surveyor general's office, platted, and made ready for the commissioner and for his approval. While these lands are being resurveyed—and that is the character of the surveys in our State, mostly—no entries can be made. It is difficult to make transfers, because the land lines and the land corners depend, of course, upon the new survey, and during that period settlement is retarded. Settlers can not make proof on their entries and transfers are difficult.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if he can tell when the new surveyor general for Wyoming was appointed or assumed office?

Mr. MONDELL. Something less than two years ago.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman remember the month?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not. It is not quite two years ago. It was very soon after the new administration was inaugurated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Several months must have intervened, I take it, after the inauguration of the new administration.

Mr. MONDELL. Not much time was lost, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That has not been the case in some other matters.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not criticize the appointment or the fact that it was made promptly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But the gentleman stated a while ago that the fact that there was so little money used during the fiscal year 1914 was due to the fact that there was a new surveyor general appointed. I am unable to say how that could affect the proposition when the new surveyor general could not possibly have come in and assumed office until about the time or possibly after the fiscal year had closed.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no. The discharge of clerks and the fact that their salaries were not paid and new clerks were not immediately appointed of course reduced the amount used, but clearly the gentleman from Tennessee has the wrong year in his mind. If he will recall the new surveyor general would have been in office nearly all the year to which he refers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. MONDELL. However that may be, I do know the situation of the surveyor general's office in Wyoming. My understanding is that he is going to use all the money that he has this year, and it is on the basis of this year's appropriation and not of last year's appropriation that this should be provided. In view of the fact that I have some real information on the subject I hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, the gentleman misunderstands me. I understand the gentleman to give as the reason for the amount of money that was spent during the year 1914 the fact that a new surveyor general had been named and that he discharged certain clerks?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; that is one of the reasons.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, the expenditures to which the gentleman refers and which he was seeking to explain were made during the fiscal year 1914, and the new administration did not come into power until March, 1913, only three months before the close of that particular fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has got the wrong year in his head.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is generally very clear, but he is just a year off in his statement.

Mr. MANN. The fiscal year 1914 did not commence until July 1, 1913, four months after President Wilson was inaugurated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I can, to get a little information. I notice under this Wyoming item the contingent expenses are \$5,000. The appropriation for clerk hire was \$12,500, and the total expenses of that office are \$16,000, including the pay of the surveyor general. What do these contingent expenses consist of?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They are put down here as incidentals. We appropriated in 1914 \$1,200. They spent—and that corresponds with what we call here in the department miscellaneous or contingent expenses—\$400. Out of the \$1,200 appropriated they spent \$400 and—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from South Carolina naturally this year, under the circumstances, has no greater information on the subject than I have. Here is a curiosity. Here is Wyoming with a surveyor general's office with a total appropriation of \$1,600. It has \$500 contingent expenses, while Colorado, with a total appropriation of \$27,250, considerably less than twice as much, has a contingent expense item of \$3,250, more than six times as much as the Wyoming office.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. They may have rented a building out of that; I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Well, I say the gentleman does not know. If they have to rent a building in one place, they have in another place probably.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Not necessarily, because we have public buildings in some places and we have not them in others.

Mr. MANN. We have a public building at Denver, Colo.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. But we may not have a building for a Government land office.

Mr. MANN. For Arizona there was a total appropriation of \$14,500; contingent expenses, \$1,500, three times as much as over in Wyoming, though the total expense of the Wyoming office is greater than the one in Arizona. California is the same thing, and the same thing is true in Idaho, and the same thing is probably true in New Mexico. South Dakota, with a total appropriation of \$5,600, has contingent expenses of \$500 only, the same amount as in Wyoming where they have three times the appropriation. Evidently somebody somewhere is trying to cut very close on contingent expenses or somebody somewhere is very extravagant with contingent expenses.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. All the gentleman says is true, and I hope the General Land Office will inquire and report to the Committee on Appropriations why there should be any such difference in the contingent expenses of the various land offices.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman from South Carolina will accept my amendment in this case, in view of the fact that I am informed with regard to the needs of this office. The surveyor general of our State is a good Democrat. I do not desire to see him embarrassed in the performance of his duty by reason of the fact that he is not given a sufficient appropriation. I am constantly importuned with regard to surveys; I am posted in regard to the condition of our surveys, and I know that if our people are to be properly served the surveyor general must have the amount which was estimated. While I am not able to say in regard to the other States, I do know in regard to Wyoming that the surveyor general ought to have this amount if he is to do promptly the necessary work.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have treated Wyoming just like we have all the other land offices. We have inserted in this bill an amount in excess of what they expended during the fiscal year 1914.

Mr. MANN. But you cut closer than in any other place.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that the year he refers to was a year of transfer from one surveyor general to another. There was a reduction in force. The work was not kept current. Of course they did not use as much money as they need next year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I will call the gentleman's attention to another thing. He says in his estimate he does not expect to use as many people in 1916 as he had in 1914.

Mr. MONDELL. Not the surveyor general of Wyoming; he does not say so.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I mean the estimates that came to us.

Mr. MONDELL. By and large, that is what the Land Office may say in regard to the entire field; but I am talking about Wyoming.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. But I am talking about Wyoming, too; and he does not ask for as many clerks in the land office in Wyoming for the fiscal year 1916 as he had, according to his detailed statement, in 1914, when he expended \$12,365.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman understands this, that he may not have or expect to have more clerks than he had altogether during the fiscal year of 1914, but quite a number of those clerks were temporary and not in the office the entire year. I have explained to the gentleman there were some vacancies that were not filled, and while the total number of clerks may be no larger or less the clerks will be employed the entire year.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. He is asking for 10 clerks less now than he had in 1914, when he expended only \$12,000.

Mr. MONDELL. It is possible, of course, that office has clerks that are not paid out of this appropriation at all. Frequently a considerable force in the surveyor general's office is not paid out of this appropriation, but is paid by parties seeking mineral surveys.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, well, that is an entirely different matter. We are appropriating for a particular force. Now, the gentleman tells us that he has another force. But we should not pay for them.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, now, the gentleman wants to be fair—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). And if the surveyor general made any suggestion about the reduction of 10, the number of people in his office, he could not have had in mind his regular force paid out of this appropriation. That was impossible. If he is making any estimate of such reduction as that, it must be on the theory that his other force will not be as large, which is not paid out of this appropriation. I reiterate what I have said, and I desire to emphasize it, that I know the condition of that office and know that it will be necessary for them to have these clerks; that the estimate provides for totaling \$20,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman is looking at page 101 of the estimates?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I am looking at page 293 of the skeleton bill. It is the same thing.

Mr. MANN. I notice under the heading of those intended to be employed at this office that they intended to employ 16 persons, and the estimate is \$20,000. The gentleman says that is a reduction of 10 persons. I notice in the other column corresponding, employed during the fiscal year 1914, 26 persons. It will be a reduction, but the 26 persons received \$12,365 salary, and among the 26 persons were 8 draftsmen, each at \$1,200; 2 clerks, each at \$1,400; 2 clerks, each at \$1,200; 5 temporary draftsmen, each at \$1,200. And I have only enumerated a few of the 26. Those which I have enumerated call for salaries of a total of more than \$20,000. So that the gentleman will see that while they employ 26 persons, that did not mean continuous employment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. There is no reduction in the number of employees at all. There is an increase that is asked for in the number of employees in the office. In other words, the eight draftsmen at \$1,200 each did not mean that they had eight draftsmen at \$1,200 each at all. If the surveyor general can not do work in his office any better than this kind of statement

means, he is inefficient and ought to be removed from office. The gentleman will agree to that, I am sure. That would lead anyone to believe that they had 26 persons, whereas they had one person employed one day, and another person another day, and a third person employed the third day, on the same job, and he calls it three persons at \$1,200 each.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I think there were 26 people who were employed at some time during that year, but they were not employed all the time. That is what I think it means.

Mr. MANN. No doubt. Twenty-six persons, all with as high salaries as the 16 persons. He figures up the 26 persons at \$12,000 and 16 persons at \$20,000, although there is no increase in salary. So the gentleman's argument rather falls to the ground.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The condition is this: The report for 1914 states what he actually paid out to these people. For 1916 he is stating what he expects to pay out, and he contemplates employing those 16 people at that salary all the time. And that is \$20,000.

Mr. MANN. I am with the gentleman. I voted with the gentleman on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]; but I felt the gentleman from Wyoming was making a pretty strong case, and I think my friend from South Carolina thought it until, I think, he got an erroneous impression from this statement that there was a reduction in the number of employees from 26 to 16, when there is no reduction intended in the number of employees. The statement would lead anyone to believe that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. There would not be as many people employed temporarily; there would be fewer people employed all the time. That is the difference.

Mr. MANN. There would be as many people employed at any one time?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Possibly so.

Mr. MANN. That is the way we count. We say that there are 435 Members. We do not say that in one Congress there are 445 Members because some of them have resigned and have had successors appointed; but this fellow would.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think we have provided ample funds for all these offices. Let us vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Division, Mr. Chairman. The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. It ought to be noted that all but 4 of the 24 who voted in the negative came out of the catacombs. There were only four Democratic Members on the floor during the discussion. The rest voted as they usually vote, without knowledge or sense. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 103, line 9, the figures "\$12,500" and insert the figures "\$18,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 103, line 9, by striking out "\$12,500" and inserting "\$18,000."

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, it strikes me as hardly fair on the part of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] to call in from the cloakrooms enough of his people who have not heard a word of the discussion on this item to vote down the amendment which I offered.

If the gentleman does not think the Democratic surveyor's office of Wyoming ought to have \$20,000, I think we have made it very clear indeed that it is entitled to more than the committee gave his office.

I want again to remind the committee of the fact that there was no investigation whatever of this matter. The department that has it in charge asked for \$20,000. The committee went back to the period of a year ago and found that only about \$12,000 had been expended and reduced the sum to \$12,500. The surveyor general of Wyoming did not expend as much in the fiscal year 1914 as he should have expended. The result was that the public service suffered, and these surveys can not be taken care of at this rate.

I would like to ask the gentlemen on the other side whether they desire to have the people of my State know and understand that this Democratic House has got to cheeseparing to the point where it is not willing to appropriate to have these surveys provided for in order that our people can settle on the

public lands—surveys provided for in order that those who own the lands and want to transfer them can do so by having the surveys accepted.

There have been many townships in my State withdrawn from entry for three or four years. Not a proof and not an entry has been made in that length of time over considerable areas because the lands were withdrawn pending resurvey.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Has not that land all been surveyed at public expense at one time?

Mr. MONDELL. Most of our surveys are resurveys.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Now you are coming back asking the Government to resurvey. Why do you want a resurvey anyway?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman can not lead me off on that tangent. We are providing for resurveys all over the country, and the gentleman from South Carolina knows why they are necessary. They are no more necessary in Wyoming than they are elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Does the gentleman mean to say that when his party was in power all the money they expended to have this land surveyed was wasted, and that the work was worthless and that we must now do it all over again?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not stated anything of that sort.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Something of that sort must be true. Either the original survey is worthless or else it is good.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, that indicates that the gentleman does not know any more about surveys than he does about this appropriation. A great many of these surveys were very well executed in the way that the law provided for their execution at that time. The country was overrun constantly with great herds of buffalo and was full of game of all sorts. The game always pawed around places and spots where the soil had been removed, and land monuments afforded them an opportunity to tear up the soil and obliterate the monuments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Between the buffalo bulls and the winds and the occasional trapper who came along and needed a stake to fasten his trap and found a land corner stake would serve that purpose, and some fellow who would pick up a land corner stone to shy at a coyote, in those various ways in the passage of time these corners became obliterated. It is true there were some fraudulent surveys, but the greater part of these surveys were executed in the way that the law contemplated at the time. But the passage and incidents of time obliterated those surveys, and resurveys are necessary. Our settlement will be retarded by reason of the fact that the surveyor general's office is not properly provided for, and I hope that the committee, if it will not give us \$20,000, will at least give us within \$2,000 of what the office asked.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MONDELL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 36.

Mr. MONDELL. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. MONDELL to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 39, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 103, line 10, by striking out the figures "\$500" and inserting "\$1,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 103, line 10, by striking out "\$500" and inserting "\$1,200."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] called attention a moment ago to the fact that the item for contingent expenses in the surveyor general's office in Wyoming was reduced to a larger degree in proportion than the items for the other States. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the State of Washington, for which the total appropriation is only \$12,500, receives \$1,500 for contingent expenses, while Wyoming is allowed only \$500.

I do not know on what theory this sum is based, and I would be very glad if the gentleman from South Carolina would tell me. If it cost \$1,500 for contingent expenses to run the surveyor general's office in the State of Washington, that will only spend \$12,000 in all, I do not understand how we can expect the surveyor general's office in Wyoming to be run for \$500 in the matter of contingent expenses when the total expenses are \$16,000. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to provide for the contingent expenses of the office by any such sum as this. There is no reason why the committee should not allow the amount asked for.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, on the face of it, it looks a little strange that we should appropriate \$1,500 for incidental expenses of the land office in the State of Washington and only \$500 for the great State of Wyoming. But the truth is this: The gentlemen who represent Wyoming in the House and Senate are always active, as Members can testify. I believe a year or two ago they had supplied a public building to every town that could be called a town, and a little place called Sundance got a national reputation because, with a population of 198 souls, they got an appropriation of \$50,000 for a public building.

Mr. MONDELL. They almost got an appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. So in every town in Wyoming that is big enough to have a post office they have a public building, and, of course, we do not have to rent offices for the surveyor general. I see that in the State of Washington in 1912 we provided \$1,500 for incidental expenses, which included rent of office, pay of the janitor, furniture and repairs thereto, and so forth. So, Mr. Chairman, all this spiel is for nothing. There is no office rent to pay in Wyoming, and they only spent \$418 in the last fiscal year when they were permitted to spend \$1,200. We have given them \$500 for next year, and it is ample.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, he proposes to punish the surveyor general of Wyoming because he was economical in 1914. Now he has estimated that he needs \$1,200 the coming fiscal year. He is a good business man, and I bear testimony to the fact that he is not disposed to spend the public money recklessly, and he probably knows how much he needs.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The gentleman has testified before the committee this afternoon that the incumbent of that office is a good Democrat and that he will not waste the money, and we will risk his getting through on \$500. Of course a Republican would need \$1,200. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Office Postmaster General: Postmaster General, \$12,000; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, \$4,000; private secretary, \$2,500; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; bookkeeper and accountant, \$1,800; 2 stenographers, at \$1,600 each; appointment clerk, \$2,000; assistant to chief clerk, \$2,000; confidential clerk to Postmaster General, \$2,000 (formerly assistant superintendent in charge of mail equipment, Fourth Assistant's Office); chairman board of inspection, \$2,000 (formerly assistant superintendent in charge of inspection of supplies, Fourth Assistant's Office); printing clerk, \$1,800 (formerly clerk of class 4, Fourth Assistant's Office); clerks—4 of class 4 (1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's Office, 1 from Division of Post Office Inspectors, and 2 to First Assistant's Office), 6 of class 3 (2 transferred from First Assistant's Office, 1 from Fourth Assistant's Office, 2 to Third Assistant's Office, 1 to Division of Post Office Inspectors, and 1 to Division of Purchasing Agent), 10 of class 2 (1 transferred from First Assistant's Office, 2 from Second Assistant's Office, 1 from Third Assistant's Office, 1 to Division of Purchasing Agent, and 1 to Division of Solicitor), 6 of class 1 (1 transferred from Division of Post Office Inspectors, 3 at \$1,000 each (3 transferred to Division of Post Office Inspectors and 1 to First Assistant's Office), 8 at \$900 each (1 transferred from Second Assistant's Office and 2 from Fourth Assistant's Office); telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 3 messengers (1 transferred from First Assistant's Office and 1 from Third Assistant's Office); 3 assistant messengers (1 transferred from Division of Post Office Inspectors); pages—2 at \$480 each (1 transferred from Second Assistant's Office and 1 from Third Assistant's Office), 3 at \$360 each (1 transferred from First Assistant's Office and 1 from Fourth Assistant's Office); engineer, \$1,400; 8 assistant engineers at \$1,000 each; electrician, \$1,400; 2 assistant electricians, at \$1,200 each; 3 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each; fireman, who shall be a blacksmith, and fireman, who shall be a steam fitter, at \$900 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 17 firemen; carpenters—1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000, 2 at \$900 each; captain of the watch, \$1,000; additional to 2 watchmen acting as lieutenant of watchmen, at \$120 each; 24 watchmen; foreman of laborers, \$800; 47 laborers (2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's Office); plumber, \$900; awning maker, \$900; female laborers—1 \$540, 3 at \$500 each, 5 at

\$480 each (2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's Office); 45 charwomen; in all, \$201,210.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. There are places appropriated for that have never been created by law. The paragraph is subject to the point of order, if the gentleman wants to mutilate the bill and reduce the activities of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the Postmaster General will be unduly or injuriously affected in the end. I hope not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Washington, D. C., new post-office building: Three assistant engineers, at \$900 each; 3 assistant electricians, at \$900 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 oilers, at \$720 each; 12 watchmen; additional to 1 watchman acting as lieutenant of watch, \$120; 15 laborers; assistant plumber, \$720; 2 female laborers, at \$480 each; 15 charwomen; in all, \$38,700.

Mr. MANN. There should be a dollar mark inserted before the figures "900" in line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office Second Assistant Postmaster General: Second Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Railway Adjustments—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,250; Division of Foreign Mails—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,000; superintendent, Division of Miscellaneous Transportation, \$2,000; clerks—13 of class 4, 23 of class 3, 18 of class 2 (2 transferred to Postmaster General's Office), 15 of class 1, 12 at \$1,000 each, 7 at \$900 each (1 transferred to Postmaster General's Office); messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers; page, \$360 (transferred from First Assistant's Office); in all, \$145,590.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph. It contains items for several offices not provided for by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That is true, Mr. Chairman. It is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in place of the paragraph stricken out the following:

"The officers and employees of the United States whose salaries are herein appropriated for are established and shall continue from year to year to the extent they shall be appropriated for by Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from South Carolina, that by unanimous consent that amendment be inserted as section 6 of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment just adopted be placed in the legislative part of the bill as section 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the amendment just adopted be inserted as section 6 of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General: Third Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Stamps—superintendent \$2,750; Division of Finance—superintendent (who shall give bond in such amount as the Postmaster General may determine for the faithful discharge of his duties) \$2,250; Division of Classification—superintendent \$2,750; Division of Registered Mails—superintendent \$2,500; Division of Money Orders—superintendent \$2,750, chief clerk \$2,250; clerks—19 of class 4, 34 of class 3 (2 transferred from Postmaster General's Office), 50 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's Office), 62 of class 1 (2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's Office, 1 to Postmaster General's Office), 40 at \$1,000 each (2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's Office); 21 at \$900 each (1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's Office); 2 messengers; in all, \$316,330.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Reverting to the matter of mail carriers in the far West who have received no pay whatever for the past five months, I desire to make it clear and to have the statement go out in the Record that no employee of the Post Office Department need hire lawyers in order to collect his money. I am putting it in this form so that it can be printed in the newspapers devoted to the Rural Delivery Service. Since I addressed the House a few moments ago I have gone a little further into this matter and have learned there are about 300 cases in which errors of some kind have been made which can not be easily discovered; numerous cases where mistakes in payment have occurred, causing other Members of Congress, I

presume, the same as myself, to receive letters something like this:

PACIFIC BEACH, WASH., November 30, 1914.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am inclosing the third letter from a law firm in Washington, asking me to give them my legal work in connection with my mail contract here on the beach. Mr. JOHNSON, I don't intend to need any legal work in connection with this mail contract. I was the lowest bidder. My contract was duly signed and sent by registered mail, and I have the return of the card that same was received. Now, why do you suppose I can't get any money? My pay is now five months in arrears. In fact, I have never received anything since commencing the work. Have not even been able to receive a reply to a courteous letter asking why my pay was being held up.

In view of these facts I am still on the job and am expected to be on the job, buying horse feed, keeping up equipment, and enduring the hardships one is obliged to endure in the fulfillment of this contract.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We are trying to get through with this bill as speedily as possible in the hope that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] may call up the Post Office bill. The matter to which the gentleman refers will be entirely appropriate in the consideration of that bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. These appropriation bills are prepared in advance by experienced members of great committees, and the only way in which other Members can call attention to these matters is during these five-minute speeches. This man has had no pay for five months, and I have other cases. The department has promised to get three months' pay off by to-day's mail to this carrier, whose name is Calvin Perry. He needs all of the money that is due him. I dislike to delay this committee, but it will do good to let western star-route carriers know that they need pay no attention to such letters from lawyers as this one:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 23, 1914.

CALVIN PERRY, Esq.,

Pacific Beach, Wash.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your contract for carrying the mails, we beg to offer our services before the Post Office Department in any matter pertaining to the same.

Differences and disputes between mail contractors and the department sometimes occur, and in such matters it is advisable for the mail contractor to have the advice and assistance of a representative in Washington familiar with the rules and practice of the department, in order that their case may be presented in person to the authorities and their interest properly protected.

Having had more than 20 years' experience in practicing before the Post Office and other departments, we can be of much assistance to mail contractors in their business relations with the Government, and shall be glad to represent you generally or in any particular matter before the Post Office Department.

We charge an annual retainer for general services or a reasonable fee for particular services rendered from time to time.

Very truly, yours,

Mr. Chairman, I was told the 1st of December by an official that this carrier, Mr. Perry, and other carriers had received three months' pay. In fact, it was suggested that I telegraph the man that three months' pay had been sent and the rest was on the way. I did so. I also wrote to him, saying that the department was not to blame, and finally, after 15 days, the carrier wired me:

Your telegram and letter received, but no money.

No one can say why or how this and other mistakes have been made or why the cards are out of place. We are dealing with the appropriation for clerks, transferring them from one department to another—fourth to the third and the third to the fourth; from the third to the second, and so on. I believe it would be wise to leave some of these clerks in their places long enough for them to straighten up these things in order to prevent these mistakes. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say on this matter at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster General: Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Rural Mails—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,000, chief clerk \$2,000; Division of Supplies—superintendent \$2,750, assistant superintendent \$2,500; assistant superintendents, Division of Equipment—superintendent \$2,750, chief clerk \$2,000 (transferred from appropriation "Labor, mail-bag repair shop, Postal Service"); clerks—14 of class 4 (2 transferred to Postmaster General's Office, 1 to Division of Solicitor), 28 of class 3 (2 transferred to Division of Solicitor, 1 to Postmaster General's Office, 1 to Division of Post Office Inspectors, 1 to Division of Purchasing Agent, and 1 transferred from First Assistant's Office), 47 of class 2 (1 transferred to First Assistant's Office, 1 to Division of Post Office Inspectors), 77 of class 1 (2 transferred to Third Assistant's Office, 1 to First Assistant's Office, 1 to Second Assistant's Office, 1 to Division of Solicitor), 53 at \$1,000 each (2 transferred to Third Assistant's Office, 1 to First Assistant's Office, 1 to Division of Purchasing Agent), 23 at \$900 each (2 transferred to Postmaster General's Office, 2 to First Assistant's Office, 1 to Third Assistant's Office, 1 to Division of Purchasing Agent); skilled draftsmen—3 at \$1,800 each, 4 at \$1,600 each, 6 at \$1,400 each, 5 at \$1,200; map moulder, \$1,200;

assistant map mounter, \$720 (1 transferred to Division of Purchasing Agent); mechanic, \$1,000; map copyists—6 at \$1,000, 1 \$900; 4 messengers (1 transferred to Division of Post Office Inspectors); 13 assistant messengers (1 transferred to Third Assistant's Office); 28 laborers (2 transferred to Postmaster General's Office); 3 female laborers, at \$480 each (2 transferred to Postmaster General's Office); in all, \$395,060.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting information. I want to ask the gentleman why there are so many transfers in these appropriations. I see there are 15 or 20 in the case of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General alone, and there seems to be a great many transfers from one department to another. Why are these made?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this bill shows upon its face just exactly where every man is employed in the Post Office Department. For years men have been carried on the rolls of one division when they were really working in some other division. We use the expression "transferred" to show where he came from. After this year that language will be dropped.

Mr. GOULDEN. As an illustration, I notice, on page 112, line 1, there are two female laborers out of three named transferred to the Postmaster General's Office. Why is that done? What reason was there for it?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. There is a certain force under the Postmaster General.

Mr. GOULDEN. I know that. Then there is a transfer from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. Why not appoint them directly to the Postmaster General's Office, or wherever they are to go, instead of going through all this circumlocution?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We do that in this particular bill to show how the change came about. The language will be dropped in subsequent bills. The purpose of the language is to show where the people are working and where they came from. The Postmaster General informs me that there is not a person in the Post Office Department working in any other place than that provided for under this bill.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think it rather confusing to find the transfer to the Postmaster General's Office, and I did not see why they could not be appointed direct. To a business man it does not seem to be a good system.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will look on page 106, he will see a statement made in the paragraph referring to the Postmaster General's Office that the two females who are transferred from this Fourth Assistant Postmaster General are transferred to the Postmaster General's Office.

Mr. GOULDEN. Why transfer them back and forth, apparently? So far, in my judgment, no business reason has been given.

Mr. TOWNER. They are not; one says "from" and the other says "to." The record is complete.

The Clerk read as follows:

Census of agriculture: For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the thirteenth and subsequent censuses, including the employment, in addition to the regular force of the permanent Census Office, of not to exceed 1,000 temporary clerks at a salary of not to exceed \$1,000 per annum for a period not to exceed two years, the Director of the Census being empowered to fix the compensation of such temporary employees engaged in the compilation and tabulation of statistics by the use of mechanical devices on a piece-price basis; the employment of special agents at a salary of not to exceed \$6 a day, with actual and necessary traveling expenses and an allowance of not to exceed \$4 a day in lieu of subsistence pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914; an appropriate allowance to such special agents as may be deemed necessary, and previously authorized by the Director of the Census for actual expenses of clerk hire, rental of quarters outside of the District of Columbia, light, heat, rental of typewriters, telephone and telegraph services, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses; the compensation of enumerators, which shall be fixed by the Director of the Census at least two weeks in advance of the enumeration, and which may be on a piece-price basis of not less than 20 or more than 50 cents for each farm reported; a mixed rate of not less than \$1 or more than \$2 a day of eight hours' work, in addition to an allowance of not less than 15 or more than 30 cents for each farm reported; or on a per diem basis of not less than \$3 or more than \$6 per day for eight hours' work, no payment to be made for any time in excess of eight hours in any one day; the employment of interpreters to assist enumerators in their respective districts in the enumeration of persons not speaking the English language, the compensation of such interpreters to be fixed by the Director of the Census in advance at not to exceed \$5 a day for each day of eight hours actually and necessarily employed; the actual and necessary traveling expenses of the various employees of the Bureau of the Census, including an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 a day pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, and necessary incidental miscellaneous and contingent expenses in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, including advertising in newspapers, purchase of manuscripts, books of reference and periodicals, and the expenditures necessary for the compilation, printing, publishing, and distributing of the results of the census, and the purchase of necessary furniture, paper, and other supplies, and the purchase, rental, construction, repair, and exchange of mechanical appliances, and other expenses necessary thereto, to be available during the fiscal years 1916 and 1917, \$2,286,100.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I would like to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The paragraph, I think, would be in order if it was made as an appropriation to carry out existing law. But this paragraph should be read, as far as the law is concerned, "for taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, \$2,286,100." The rest of the two and a half pages is legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Does not the gentleman think that where we are appropriating as large a sum of money as we are here to carry out an existing law that these limitations in the way of legislation are not of place, and that they are better than it would be to appropriate a lump sum of two millions and a quarter dollars?

Mr. MANN. I think it was entirely appropriate for the committee in proposing the expenditure of this sum of money to guard it by legislative provisions. But that makes it subject to a point of order; but I hoped that if I can strike the item out of the bill on a point of order, even if an amendment be agreed to in committee, that we would be sure of having a roll call in the House, and that there might be such a feeling come over the conscience of Members that we would save the \$2,000,000 we are extracting from the people through the stamp tax. At any rate the provision that the Director of the Census is empowered to fix the compensation of employees engaged in the compilation of statistics by the use of mechanical devices on a piece-price basis is legislation. And if the chairman desires me, I will read the rest of the legislative provision. There is nothing but legislation in it. The provision for the compensation of enumerators is legislation, both as to piecework and as to the daily allowance. I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have the act which provides for the taking of the Thirteenth Decennial Census. Section 31 of that act provides:

That there shall be in the year 1915, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and live stock, which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. The schedule employed in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of October 1 and shall relate to the current year. The Director of the Census may appoint enumerators or special agents for the purpose of this census, in accordance with the provisions of the permanent census act.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is inserted in the bill in compliance with section 31 of the census act of 1909. The law provides that this census of agriculture and live stock shall be taken in the year 1915 and every 10 years thereafter. It provides that the schedules shall be arranged by the Director of the Census and that he may appoint enumerators or special agents for the purpose of the census in accordance with the provisions of the census law. There is not a thing in this paragraph that is in violation of the law. We give him \$2,286,100 for the purpose of taking the census required by law. We have a right to limit the number of clerks that he can employ with that money. We have a right to limit the compensation that he shall pay those clerks. The law authorizes him to appoint clerks, but does not fix the compensation. It authorizes him to appoint special agents, but does not fix the compensation, and we have undertaken in this paragraph, in carrying out the law, to limit him in the expenditure of this vast sum of money. I do not believe that there is a line in the paragraph that is not a proper limitation and that can be construed as permanent law.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the gentleman's contention that the law specifically authorizes him to appoint clerks for this purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes; I just read it.

Mr. LENROOT. As I understood the gentleman, he said enumerators and special agents.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, the gentleman used the word "clerks."

Mr. MANN. Enumerators, or special agents.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The word "clerk" is not used in the organic law. Of course, Mr. Chairman, it would be idle to gather facts and not provide for compilation. We are limiting the gathering of the statistics and the compiling of them. Compilation is a necessary incident of field work.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, section 31 of the act providing for the agricultural census is a very simple proposition, and

under it Congress would be authorized to appropriate such a sum of money as it pleased for the purpose of taking a census of agriculture and live stock for this coming year, as of the 1st of October. The act provides that the Director of the Census may employ enumerators or special agents in accordance with the provisions of the permanent census act. That legislation fixes what employees may be employed by the Director of the Census and how they shall be employed, and he could employ them under an appropriation which we make; but the Committee on Appropriations in reporting it, whether wisely or unwisely, and I would not say unwisely, has attempted to have Congress define what the act, as far as it goes, would give to the Director of the Census to define, and then covers a lot of other things besides. For instance, this provision endeavors to provide that there shall be allowed not to exceed 1,000 temporary clerks at a salary of not to exceed \$1,000 per annum. That is legislation. Further—

The Director of the Census, being empowered to fix the compensation of such temporary employees engaged in the compilation and tabulation of statistics by the use of mechanical devices on a piece-price basis—

That is legislation. Under the original census act the Director of the Census very likely could fix the annual or monthly salaries for these enumerators and special agents, but this is legislation. There is a great deal more of legislation all of the way through, as, for instance, the following provision:

The compensation of enumerators, which shall be fixed by the Director of the Census at least two weeks in advance of the enumeration, and which may be on a piece-price basis of not less than 20 or more than 50 cents for each farm reported; a mixed rate of not less than \$1 or more than \$2 a day of eight hours' work, in addition to an allowance of not less than 15 or more than 30 cents for each farm reported; or on a per diem basis of not less than \$3 or more than \$6 per day for eight hours' work, no payment to be made for any time in excess of eight hours in any one day.

All of that is legislation. That is not an appropriation. That is an authorization or requirement that the Director of the Census shall have the power to do certain things or shall do certain things in a way fixed by Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is not that rather a limitation upon the amount that he shall pay?

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

Mr. BARTLETT. As to the amount?

Mr. MANN. There is no limitation about fixing it at not less than 20 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that in view of this provision, and construing this provision in connection with the census act of 1909, while this provision does partake somewhat of the character of a limitation, yet, in the judgment of the Chair, it is not really a limitation but is legislation, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to this paragraph after we have prepared an amendment which we will offer, which we think will not be subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to return later to this paragraph. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 119, after line 11, insert the following:
"Census of agriculture: For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, \$2,286,100."

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire to be heard now?

Mr. BARTLETT. We offer the amendment.

Mr. GILLET. I wish to oppose the amendment. I did not know whether the gentleman wished to say anything first or not.

Mr. BARTLETT. Not just now.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House have been criticized occasionally by the other side when we have suggested that they were not exercising proper economy because we did not point out specific instances where they might economize.

Now, it is difficult ordinarily to select specific economies by amendment, because they ought of course to be provided by the committees and not be prepared upon the floor of this House. The bill which the committee provides can not as a rule be very wisely reduced on the floor, but here is an instance where it seems to me there is opportunity for a specific economy, and

therefore I oppose this amendment. I do not deny that such a census may be desirable. I do not deny that it might be useful. All I claim is that in the present stress of our finances it is no time to indulge in anything except absolute necessities, and it seems to me, desirable as a census of agriculture may be, it is a luxury rather than a necessity and ought not to be paid for now. If I had control of expenditures and appropriations in the present condition of the Treasury, I not only would refuse to appropriate for a census of agriculture, but I would strike out the appropriation for the census of manufactures which comes this year. Hardly any of that has been spent. I believe there is \$200,000 carried in this bill and over \$400,000 that has not been expended, so that if that were stricken out and this were stricken out there would be a saving of \$3,000,000 for what can not be considered a necessity, no matter how useful it may be.

Now, the estimates admit that there would be a deficit of about \$35,000,000 this year; that the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated revenues by about \$35,000,000. But the administration subtracts from that the \$60,000,000 sinking fund, and it hardly lies in our mouth to criticize that, because nothing has been put in the sinking fund for several years—and that makes a surplus of \$35,000,000. But that surplus has already been wiped out, because to make that surplus the Secretary of the Treasury estimated that the Post Office appropriation bill would only be \$297,000,000—an estimate which, in my opinion, he had no right to make, because it was based upon the theory that the existing law would be changed and that rural routes would be supplanted by the contract system. Originally he had no right at all to make such a supposition, and it has already been contradicted by the report of the Post Office Committee which has come in; and instead of appropriating \$297,000,000 the appropriation will be \$322,000,000, leaving in the carrier system. So there is \$25,000,000 that is taken out of his surplus, and there is not any surplus at all. Then, in order to make an apparent surplus, it is claimed that the \$18,000,000 which are estimated for the Panama Canal will not be paid out of the revenues, although the Republican administration paid double that year after year, but that it will be paid by issuing bonds. But even if we issue bonds, and so make again a nominal surplus of about \$19,000,000, that surplus of \$19,000,000 will be wiped out if the supplemental appropriations this year are as big as they were last year, for last year those were \$19,000,000. This year, apparently, they will be more, because on the very first day of the session supplemental estimates were introduced of over \$4,000,000; and, moreover, the estimates in the sundry civil bill have no public-building estimates. I do not believe this Democratic majority is going to be so self-denying or patriotic as to deny themselves all public buildings this year. So that surplus is not only wiped out, but a deficit is already created. Now, under those circumstances, a deficit staring us in the face, and with the unsettled condition of trade and finance the world over, with the estimates of revenues falling much below what is needed, I think now is the time to economize strictly instead of indulging ourselves in such luxuries as this census, desirable as it might be in a time of plenty and prosperity.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that gentlemen on the other side oppose this provision for the taking of an agricultural census. The political party to which the gentlemen on the other side belong has always posed as a friend of the farmer, but I have observed that through the long series of years when they were in power there was very little, if any, legislation enacted for the direct benefit of the farmer or the agricultural classes. Their action in opposing this particular provision is but another striking evidence of their want of sympathy with the agricultural classes of this country. Eleven years ago a Republican Congress and a Republican administration provided for a quinquennial census of manufactures, and an appropriation was made for the purpose of taking that census. A year ago, under a Democratic Congress, another appropriation of \$75,000 was made for a similar census, and we heard no word of objection from any gentleman on the other side.

When the proposition was up to take a census of manufactures we did not hear the plea of economy raised which we hear now when it is proposed to take a census on behalf of and for the benefit of the farmers of this country. I do not criticize the action in taking a census of manufactures. It doubtless has resulted in great good, but there are equally good reasons why an agricultural census should be taken.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; not just now. I will yield in a moment. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the provision that is proposed in this bill? In 1909 a law was passed providing that

in the year 1915 a census of agriculture should be taken showing the acreage of farm lands, the number of acres devoted to the cultivation of the principal crops, and the number of domestic live stock in the country. That bill was passed, as I say, in 1909, and the Appropriations Committee have simply brought in here a provision which will enable the proper officials to carry out and administer that law which was enacted in the interest of the agricultural classes of this country. I regret that gentlemen upon the other side saw fit to make a point of order against the provision as it was proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, for we thought it desirable to limit those who are to take this census and to make specific provision as to what salaries should be paid.

But owing to the point of order made by gentlemen on the other side that provision has gone out. And it has been necessary to offer an amendment simply making an appropriation of the amount actually necessary to carry out the provisions of the law of 1909, without limitations as to either the number of employees or the salaries to be paid.

Now, I have said that this provision is for the benefit of the agricultural classes of this country. The same reasons that can be given by any gentleman for the taking of a census of manufactures will apply to the taking of the census of agriculture. If it was wise when the gentlemen upon the other side provided for a census of manufactures in 1905, or in 1914, when they did not utter a protest against taking the census of manufactures—I say if it was wise then to make an appropriation sufficient for that purpose, then it is wise to-day in the interest of the general good of the country, and particularly in the interest of the farmers, to make an appropriation for the purpose of taking the census of agriculture. The committee knows that from year to year the Department of Agriculture makes estimates as to the number of acres planted to various crops in this country. Those estimates are at the outset based largely upon the facts disclosed by the decennial census. If an error creeps into the compilation of the facts gathered under the decennial census, then it is carried into these estimates from year to year, and by the time the next decennial census is held, or certainly as the end of the decade approaches, the estimates made by the Department of Agriculture may be worth little, if anything. Therefore Congress in its wisdom in 1909 decided that it was to the interest of the farmer, who wants this information, and who ought to have this information, that an accurate census should be taken in the year 1915 which shall be devoted only to three main questions, namely, the number of acres of farm land, the number of acres devoted to the cultivation of the principal crops, and the number of domestic live stock in this country. And I hope that the Committee of the Whole will adopt this amendment, because, as I said, it was proposed at the outset in favor of the farmers, who have had less direct benefits from legislation than any other class of citizens in this country. [Applause.] It is particularly important at this time that the farmers shall know the acreage of the various principal crops. Conditions in Europe will doubtless bring a change in the growing of certain crops in some sections of the country, at least for the time being; and the farmer should know how much wheat, or corn, or tobacco, or cotton is being produced in any year, in order to know how he can best cultivate his lands for the next year so as to bring the greatest return for his labor. Such information will also enable him to determine with some degree of accuracy what he ought to receive for the product of his year's toil. The taking of this census will furnish this information. If it was thought important in 1909, when the law was passed, there is, as I have said, a still greater reason now why it should be thought important and necessary for the farming classes.

Mr. GILLET and Mr. GOOD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment in the way of a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 119, line 12, insert:

"That section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, is hereby repealed."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. It is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to make the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point of order that it is new legislation.

Mr. GOOD. Of course it is new legislation, but it comes under the Holman rule, and will save \$2,200,000 a year. The amendment I offer is a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as has been suggested, there is quite a difference between an amendment reducing an appropriation in a bill and one absolutely repealing the law.

Mr. GOOD. We repealed the mileage law the other day simply to reduce the amount of mileage to Members.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The amendment showed on its face that there would be a reduction of the amount carried in the bill. Now this, Mr. Chairman, does not undertake to reduce the appropriation that is sought to be made by the amendment, but absolutely repeals the law.

Mr. MANN. It reduces the amount carried by the bill and the amendment a little over \$2,000,000 and repeals the law. It does reduce it. The item in the bill on mileage the other day did not say anything about the amount carried in the bill. Still that was held in order because it reduced the expenditures of the Government. The item of appropriation was a separate item in the bill. There was a separate item on mileage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, which provides for taking the agriculture census, was an amendment, so I am told, suggested by the present Postmaster General, Mr. Burleson, who forced the Committee on the Census to accept it. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] became quite eloquent in his plea in behalf of the farmer. He went to the extent of claiming that it was necessary to take this census in 1915 for the farmer's benefit. I represent one of the greatest agricultural communities in this country, and I would not do a thing that would in any way injure in the slightest degree the agricultural industry. But this appropriation will not aid the farmer. This law provides that this census shall be taken to ascertain the acreage of farm lands, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of domestic animals on the farms and ranges. I hold here the Agricultural Yearbook for the year 1913, and that yearbook gives all of the information with regard to the principal crops, and not only the principal crops but the minor crops as well. It gives the acreage, and it gives the amount that is raised per acre in each State in the Union.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. For a brief question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman if he was not aware that those figures were based largely on estimates instead of the actual facts?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; largely on estimates gathered by a large corps of experts in the Department of Agriculture that we appropriate for every year, and I want to say to the gentleman that when we compare these estimates with the Federal census that is taken every 10 years, we find they are practically the same for those years for which we take the census, which shows the estimates are nearly correct. Besides this agricultural census, if we appropriate \$2,286,100 for it, will result largely in an estimate. Where is the farmer who can report exactly the amount of hay or corn which he raises? Let us see what information we have in this Agricultural Yearbook. Now, take 1913 on corn. The number of acres was 105,000,830; the yield per acre was 26.1 bushels; the total production was 2,446,888,000 bushels; the value was \$1,692,002,000. And it gives the lowest price and the highest price paid by the year, and by going through these reports you will find the same information on wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, sweet potatoes, hay, clover and timothy seed, cotton, tobacco, flax, rice, hops, beans, peas, sugar, coffee, turpentine, rosin, oil seed, and oil meal. We find the same provision with regard to all domestic animals, not only in regard to the total number, but we find the information is given by States. One hundred and forty-five pages of this book are devoted exclusively to the very detailed information with regard to the production upon the farms and the number of farm animals upon the farms, together with their value. Talk about duplication of work! Never again on that side should anyone say anything with regard to spending money for duplication of work if we pass this item granting \$2,280,000 for this useless undertaking—for an undertaking where we already have all the information at our command which the Director of the Census can possibly secure.

Now, I can well conceive, if we did not know these things, that it would be important for the country to have the knowledge that is contained in this census that has already been

taken; and which is published annually; but when we have this information, which is absolutely reliable, I do not see the use of spending a single penny in order that another Government official may take it. If you want those thousand men for political henchmen, take them; take them in the name of the Democratic spoilsmen, but do not ask for them in the name of the American farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The farmer does not want them. The farmer has no need of that information, when he already has all that information at his command. Oh, yes; you want a thousand men to turn loose on the communities, and you want the people of the United States, who are now being taxed more heavily than ever before in the history of this country, to go down into their pockets to buy tax stamps for this useless census, to pay for an absolutely useless thing—useless except for the salaries of these thousand men that you are going to employ for political purposes. You may need them for political purposes, but the farmers do not want to pay taxes to secure information already in their possession. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina and Mr. BARTLETT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, what a change has come over the spirit of the dream of my friend from Iowa [Mr. Good]. In 1909, when the Republican Party was in full control of the Government and the political goose hung high, his clarion voice for economy was not heard. It was silent as an oyster on that subject. When the provision contained in the census bill of 1909, prepared by a Republican Committee on the Census and voted for by a Republican majority, launched out to become permanent law, to take the agricultural census of this country; when a Republican President had just been inaugurated and there was no cloud upon the political sky—

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course; I always yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] just told us that the Democrats had passed this bill; that the Republicans never did anything for agriculture. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman misunderstood.

Mr. GILLET. I knew it was a mistake.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the provision was proposed by a former Member of this House, now a member of the Cabinet, the Postmaster General.

Mr. MANN. It was proposed by a Republican committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Be that as it may, it was in 1909, when the Republicans had the majority, and they had had it for about 16 years. I think you had about 60 majority in the House then. You had the power to defeat it. If we had said to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], or any other gentleman on that side, that they would turn loose on the country the Republican spoilsmen, they would have held up their hands in holy horror.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman point out a single bit of information that could be obtained by the expenditure of this money—information that has not already been obtained by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will allow me to make my speech, I will gratify him. But the gentleman can not divert me by a remark of that kind from an expression of my admiration of the consistency he displayed then, considering the position he takes now. The gentleman would undoubtedly have remained "in innocuous desuetude" in reference to this matter [laughter on the Democratic side], and his clarion voice would not have rung out in this Hall to-day if it were probable that these spoilsmen that are to be imposed on the agricultural interests of this country were to be appointed by a Republican Director of the Census. But it so happens that if a census shall be taken of the agricultural interests, these thousand places may, perchance, be filled by Democrats, and therefore a spasm of economy comes over the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] and over the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. Not only a spasm of economy, but a spasm of opposition to the appointment of spoilsmen to office.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I support this measure because it is required by law, and because it is deemed necessary by those having in charge this work. In justification of it, I desire to call attention to a letter addressed to the chairman of this subcommittee by the Director of the Census, which I will put into the Record, in which he says there is ab-

solutely no question as to the extreme desirability of taking a census of agriculture in 1915 and every five years thereafter. I read:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, December 15, 1914.

Hon. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE BARTLETT: I am sending you herewith a copy of my letter, together with copies of Exhibits 1 and 2 which I have just sent to Hon. JOSEPH T. JOHNSON, chairman of the subcommittee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Any assistance you may render us at this time will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly, yours,

WM. J. HARRIS, Director.

DECEMBER 15, 1914.

Hon. JOSEPH T. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In reply to your inquiry of yesterday, I desire to submit the following information concerning certain work of this bureau:

(1) CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE.

There can be no question of the extreme desirability of taking a census of agriculture in 1915 and every five years thereafter. The Department of Agriculture bases all of its crop estimates upon the figures secured by actual enumeration by the Bureau of the Census. Without such an enumeration of the principal facts with regard to the farms of the country and their products the estimates made by the Department of Agriculture and by private individuals from year to year necessarily become increasingly wide of the mark. With a five-year enumeration these estimates, based on actual enumeration, will become more nearly representative of the actual conditions.

In the second place, the rapidity with which changes in agricultural conditions are taking place and the bearing of those changes upon the problem of the cost of living and other fundamental economic problems make it essential that an agricultural census should be taken more frequently than once in a decade. At this time it is especially important that such a census should be taken for the year 1915 because of the great changes in crop acreage and crop production to be brought about as a result of the European war. It is important for this country to know as early as possible just what these changes will be, especially with reference to grain crops, crops for the export trade, and the live stock of the country. This country is being drained of its horses and mules, as well as its food cattle, for war purposes abroad. It is more than probable that the United States will not only have to feed but also to clothe a large percentage of the stricken population of Europe during the next few years.

My estimate for the census of agriculture in 1915 calls for \$2,286,100. For the segregation of these items please see Exhibit 1, which gives a statement showing the cost of the 1910 census of agriculture as compared with the estimate for 1915. In making up the estimates for 1915, compared with corresponding items for 1910, it was necessary in a few cases, which have been indicated on Exhibit 1, to make very careful estimates of the amount spent for agriculture in 1910. Some of the items, of course, include population expenditures, because in the rural sections of the country the same enumerator reported both population and agriculture. However, the estimated cost of the population end of the inquiry has been eliminated as far as possible.

In 1910 there were approximately 70,000 enumerators, of which 40,000 were in the rural districts. In 1910 they enumerated 6,361,502 farms, at an average cost of approximately 36 cents per farm. In the estimate submitted for the census of 1915 I have estimated that the total number of farms will be 6,750,000, and that I can enumerate these farms at an average cost of 28 cents per farm. The agricultural schedule used in 1910 contained more than 500 inquiries, while the schedule which I propose to use at this census will be very brief and will call for only the general items of acreage in farms, acreage of principal crops, and number and value of live stock.

The largest item of my estimate is for the employment of enumerators. You will note that I ask for \$1,900,000 to employ between 10,000 and 12,000 enumerators to report the statistics of the farms in the United States. The corresponding item in 1910 was \$2,306,000. The estimate for 1915 is a very close estimate and was figured with great care. Even with a much shorter schedule than the bureau used in 1910 there still remains the principal factor of any canvass, which is the travel from farm to farm. In fact, the distance at this census will be greater than it was in 1910, because there will be approximately 400,000 more farms for the enumerators to visit. While I will have to enumerate approximately 400,000 more farms than were enumerated in 1910, I propose to do the work for more than \$400,000 less than the actual enumeration cost in 1910.

You will also note the item of \$200,000 which I have estimated for temporary clerical assistance. The corresponding expense in 1910 was \$1,002,140. In 1910 the temporary clerical force was paid from \$600 to \$1,200 per annum; in my estimate I propose to use a less number of clerks and to pay them smaller salaries—that is, from \$600 to \$900 per annum.

You will also note that I am asking for only \$54,000 for the employment of special agents for supervisory and other field work. In 1910 the corresponding item for supervisors and supervisors' assistants was \$1,080,000. This item for 1910 included the cost of the supervision of the population work. It is impossible to segregate it so as to show agriculture alone. I know, however, that my estimate is very much less than the proportion which should properly be charged to agriculture.

My estimate for travel, subsistence, office expenses, etc., is approximately one-third of what it was in 1910. My estimate for interpreters is one-third of what it was in 1910. You understand, of course, that it is necessary to have interpreters in sections of our country where we have a large number of foreign-born population. These immigrant farmers have not been in this country long enough to become thoroughly familiar with our language; hence it is necessary to reach them in the language of the country of their birth.

The general office expenses, as you will note, are considerably less, item by item, than the corresponding items for 1910. I wish to particularly call your attention to the item for machines (\$10,000). In 1910 the corresponding item was \$129,000.

I ask for only \$3,000 for the employment of one chief statistician, who will be an expert on agriculture and who will give his entire time and attention to the agricultural census.

Furthermore, I propose, if Congress gives me the appropriation, to make no extravagant expenditures but to practice economy in every item possible. Rather than stretch the agricultural census over two or three years it is my intention to complete the work within 12 months after it actually begins. I will supply the Department of Agriculture with its actual figures in time to make its crop estimates for the year of 1916. I will also complete all of the tabulations and print the final results in a few small handy publications rather than in the large and ponderous volumes of the Thirteenth Census. It will be my endeavor to make this census of agriculture the very best census of its kind that has ever been made in the United States. I propose to do the work quickly, both in the field and in the office, and to have all the results published at a much earlier date than has ever been done before.

(2) ECONOMIES.

In this connection I desire to call your attention to the fact that I have endeavored in every way to introduce economies in all of my expenditures. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1914 amounted to \$1,122,820; later \$2,500 was appropriated for tabulating machines and \$50,000 was reapportioned out of the unexpended balance for the preceding year. This gave me a total appropriation of \$1,175,320. On July 1, 1914, I had to my credit an unexpended balance of \$39,794. While this item may appear small in comparison with the total appropriation, yet it is the result of small savings and represents only a beginning in the line of economy in the Census Bureau under my administration.

Wealth, debt, and taxation: I am just now completing our decennial inquiry on wealth, debt, and taxation. Ten years ago the work on this inquiry started March 1, 1903, and it was not finally completed and results ready for distribution till May 7, 1907—more than four years from the beginning of the field work. I began my inquiry on March 21, 1914, and expect to complete the work and issue the final report within a year and a half after beginning the work. I have made a very considerable saving in the cost of my investigation compared with that of 10 years ago, which is due in part to the fact that some 15 or 20 per cent of the statistics collected at the present inquiry were obtained from published reports of the various governmental units and the work done here in the office at Washington, rather than by personal canvass in the field.

While I am unable to make any comparison of the cost of the two investigations because of the lack of any cost accounting 10 years ago, I am satisfied that my saving on the present investigation has been at least \$150,000.

Census of manufactures: I desire to call your attention to the complete statement concerning the census of manufactures for 1914. This is marked Exhibit 2. Kindly note the fact that, while the number of manufacturing establishments in the United States has increased during the last five years, I propose to secure the reports at less cost each than was paid in 1910; that is, the cost per schedule at this census will be considerably less than at the previous census.

The detailed statement concerning the census of manufactures also shows that there has been a considerable saving in a number of items. At this time we have saved at least \$1,000 by borrowing city directories from the Library of Congress and others instead of purchasing them outright, as was done in 1910. We will also save at least \$2,000 by securing quarters for our local offices in Government buildings, rather than paying rent for quarters, as was done in a number of cases in 1910. Local agents will be employed at 20 per cent less salary than in 1910.

I propose to make this the best census of manufactures that has ever been taken in the United States. With that end in view we have consulted manufacturers' associations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade, etc., in all sections of the country, and have secured the cooperation of practically all of these bodies.

Any other information desired by you or by any member of the committee will be gladly furnished by me.

Very respectfully, yours,

WM. J. HARRIS, Director.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will put into the RECORD a table that the director has prepared and submitted to the committee as to the cost of taking this agricultural census under a Republican administration and the amount that will be required under this administration. I am not making any charges about improper administration, but figures are given as to what it would cost to take this same kind of census in 1910 and what he proposes to do with the money appropriated. The sum of it is that in 1910 it cost the Government \$4,943,121, and under the items that he submits it will cost now only \$2,126,100.

I say it, not in any boasting spirit at all because the Director of the Census is a Georgian, but the administration of that office has been run economically and the expenses have been reduced very much during his administration.

Now, one word more. We have seen fit to provide for the taking of the census of the manufactures of this country. We have not until this time—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have not heard from my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] or from my good friend from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] any objection until now to the taking of the census of manufactures; but now appears this great idea, that out of this appropriation will come 1,000 appointees, presumably Democrats, to carry out the law, and therefore they raise their voices in behalf of economical administration. Gentlemen, it would have been well for you to have thought of economy and the avoidance of useless expenditures when the money was being

expended under a Republican administration and the places were being filled by Republican appointees.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may be permitted to print as a part of my remarks the letter of the Director of the Census that has been sent to us, transmitting the other letter and the exhibits accompanying it. I will insert them here:

EXHIBIT I.

Statement showing the estimated cost of the 1915 census of agriculture as compared with the estimated cost of the 1910 census of agriculture.

| | 1915 | 1910 |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| 1 chief statistician (2 years in 1910)..... | \$3,000 | \$6,000 |
| Clerks, at \$600 to \$900 per annum for from 1 month to 12 months (paid \$600 to \$1,200 in 1910)..... | 200,000 | 1,002,149 |
| 10,000 to 12,000 enumerators (approximately 40,000 enumerators engaged on agriculture in 1910)..... | 1,900,000 | 2,306,000 |
| Expert special agents for office work..... | | 15,000 |
| Special agents for supervisory and other field work (includes supervision and clerical assistance for population in 1910)..... | 54,000 | 1,080,000 |
| Travel, subsistence, office expenses, etc., of clerks and special agents (includes expense for population in 1910)..... | 35,000 | 99,204 |
| Interpreters (includes population in 1910)..... | 12,500 | 37,349 |
| Printing..... | | 95,452 |
| General office expenses: Purchase rental, repair, and exchange of adding and calculating machines and typewriters..... | 10,000 | 129,000 |
| Furniture..... | 5,500 | 12,000 |
| Folios for schedules..... | 2,000 | 8,000 |
| Telegraph and telephone service (includes population in 1910)..... | 6,000 | 21,476 |
| Schedules, result slips, circulars, and other forms..... | 20,000 | 60,000 |
| Paper and stationery..... | 10,000 | 20,000 |
| Shipping cost, including boxes, paper, twine, etc..... | 5,100 | 8,000 |
| Forms and miscellaneous supplies for enumerators and special agents..... | 3,000 | 7,000 |
| Enumerators' badges..... | | 1,500 |
| Miscellaneous expenses (rent of offices, janitor service, light, etc.)..... | 20,000 | 35,000 |
| Total..... | 2,286,100 | 4,943,121 |

NOTE.—In 1910, 6,361,502 farms were enumerated, at a cost of approximately 36 cents each; in 1915 it is estimated that 6,750,000 farms will be enumerated, at an average cost of 28 cents.

EXHIBIT II.

DECEMBER 14, 1914.

The census of manufactures of 1910 was taken in connection with the census of mines and quarries, and it is impossible to make an exact separation of the statistics for the two branches of work. We, however, have prepared a careful estimate, and it appears that the total cost of the work approximated \$1,476,736, of which \$676,736 was expended for field work and \$800,000 for office work. The work extended over a period of three and one-half years.

The expenses of the office work for the census of manufactures of 1914 will, of course, be met by the regular annual appropriation for the salaries of persons holding statutory positions. There will be no temporary office force employed. The work therefore differs very materially from the work for the census of 1910, when a large temporary force was employed for a considerable time. We also hope to virtually complete the field work of the census during the present fiscal year, but it is impossible to state in advance whether we will be able to secure returns from all of the manufacturing establishments by June 30, 1915. Therefore I have estimated that an additional sum of \$190,300 be appropriated for this work for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. This is necessary because, if the work is not finished by June 30, 1915, and there is no provision made for continuing the canvass, all of the work done prior to June 30, 1915, would be of no use whatever, as it would not enable us to publish the totals for the manufactures in the United States.

There has been appropriated and set aside for the census of manufactures of 1914, \$470,000, to be expended for field work during the fiscal year. It has also been estimated that the office work during the year ending June 30, 1915, on this branch of the census would amount to approximately \$380,000, making a total expenditure for the present fiscal year of \$850,000.

The Director of the Census has endeavored in every way possible to effect economies in the conduct of his bureau, especially in the field work incident to the collection of statistics. In taking a census of manufactures, however, there are unavoidable delays incident to the impossibility of some manufacturers preparing their reports promptly. A large proportion of the manufacturing establishments of the country do not keep accurate books, and many of them keep no account of the year's operations from which they can prepare census reports. It is necessary, therefore, for the agents to visit many establishments a number of times and to make repeated requests for the statistics, also for the agents to devote considerable time in the compilation of the statistics that the manufacturers have not prepared in advance of their visit. The Director has endeavored in every way to overcome this condition; he has conferred with a large number of manufacturing organizations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and other organizations throughout the country. He has had these associations pass resolutions recommending that their membership cooperate with the Bureau of the Census and that they make returns promptly to the bureau, so as to avoid the expense of sending a special agent to collect the returns. He has also mailed the blank schedules to all of the manufacturers with a request that they be prepared and returned to the bureau promptly by mail.

In appointing the field force of agents it has been his policy to appoint special agents who will be employed in collecting the statistics at lower salaries than were paid for the census of 1909. He hopes in these various ways to effect economies that will result in a material saving; but in view of the experience of the bureau at past censuses, he does not feel warranted in materially decreasing the estimate which he has submitted. He has found that at prior censuses considerable amounts were paid for the rent of offices in the different cities. He has arranged to save this by securing office accommodations in the Federal buildings.

He also found that it had been necessary to purchase directories to be used in compiling the lists of the names and addresses of manufacturers, although the directories for all the cities were on file in the Congressional Library. After considerable correspondence he was able to effect a cooperative arrangement with the Librarian so as to borrow the directories from the Congressional Library for the temporary use of the Bureau of the Census. In these two items alone he has effected a saving of between \$3,000 and \$4,000. It is his purpose to continue to effect economies of this character.

The appropriation for the present fiscal year provides for the census of manufactures, and the additional amount is what it is estimated should be appropriated in order to insure its completion. It would be detrimental if this sum of \$190,300 were not appropriated and the Bureau of the Census were therefore unable to make any use of the statistics which they had already collected at a cost of about \$500,000.

It is the purpose of the Director of the Census to virtually complete the field work on the census of manufactures during this fiscal year; but it is absolutely necessary for him to make provision for any contingency, and therefore the estimate of \$190,300 is made to complete the field work on this census during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. There will, of course, be considerable office work to be done in compiling the statistics of manufactures after June 30, 1915, but the director is quite confident that he can do this work with the regular employees of the bureau, and therefore does not make any increase in his estimate over the regular annual appropriation that is made for the office work of the bureau. As far as can now be estimated, the total cost of the census of manufactures of 1914 will approximate \$1,340,300, as compared with \$1,476,736 for the same piece of work at the census of 1910.

The director thus estimates that he will be able to take the census of manufactures for \$136,436 less than it cost in 1910, although there has undoubtedly been a considerable increase in the number of establishments to be enumerated, and the statistics in many respects are much more in detail than they were at former censuses.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that the object of taking this census is to benefit the farmer. A census so taken is no more for the benefit of the farmers of the United States than it is for the benefit of the inhabitants of Mars.

Let us consider when this census shall be taken and when the report would be made. If taken at all, as I understand, it will be taken some time during the summer of the next year, and the report will be printed from it some time from three to five years afterwards. Now, it may be that farmers in the districts represented by the gentlemen who are supporting these paragraphs are hunting up statistics after the expiration of three to five years to determine the amount of acreage or production, but they certainly do not do that in my district. As soon as the wheat crop of the United States is sown the farmer takes his newspaper and finds the amount of acreage estimated, and a little later he gets from the Department of Agriculture, if he wishes, a more accurate estimate made by the experts who report for that department. Later on, as the wheat crop is harvested, the threshers are no sooner at work than he gets an estimate of the amount which the yield is going to be. Later he gets a very accurate statement, in that same year, of the amount which the crop has been. He never takes down his 5-year-old report, gathered by these census enumerators, to ascertain what it was five years ago, unless he does it simply as a student for purposes of general information. This census is of no value whatever to any farmer for farming purposes. If he is a student of such matters, he may want to read the report when it comes out, as it will probably come out along about the year 1920, but he will never look at it in any other way.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman's estimate as to the time when this report will be printed is based on the time when the reports of the census of 1910 were printed, is it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is based on past experience. I think that is a very good guide.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has evidently overlooked the fact that this census is a very simple matter, confined to a few items, and not nearly as complicated as the census of 1910, so that no one will have to wait many years before it is printed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will pardon me, he is entirely mistaken. I have not overlooked that fact, and I have not overlooked the fact that only the same proportionate number of employees will be put on this work, and consequently there is no reason to expect that it will be completed any earlier.

With reference to the census of manufactures, concerning which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] spoke, there is a very different reason for taking that. There is no other way in which the information can be obtained. For that reason it is much more important that the census should be taken, although I think its value is somewhat exaggerated.

Now, I do not mean to say that the census which is proposed by this amendment is of no value whatever. It is of value in the same way that general statistics of that character are of value, but it is of no use to the farmer, and it is idle to stand here and say that the proposition is solely for his benefit, for it is not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], and I think it is extremely fitting that an amendment to repeal this law should come from the other side of the main aisle.

My reason for supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman is not the same reason which he offers. In the five minutes that he occupied it was easy to be seen that the principal objection that he had to this provision in this appropriation bill was that it would provide a few places for Democrats.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that he is entirely mistaken. My reason for offering it was that the very information is obtained by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I know the gentleman said that, but he placed very much less emphasis on that part of his speech than he did upon the fact that there are a thousand places to be filled by Democrats.

Mr. GOOD. I merely made that argument in answer to remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman desires to ask a question, I will yield to enable him to do so.

Mr. GOOD. I will state to the gentleman that my sole object and motive was to prevent duplication of work and the useless expenditure of money.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman had only that purpose, why did he interject so much opposition to this because of the fact that it would make places for a few Democrats? The gentleman is so politically biased that he can not see straight. This is not the first time that he has displayed that fact upon this floor. The Republican Party placed this law upon the statute book. Why did you not say, then, that there was no necessity for an agricultural census?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was not here at that time.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will not be interrupted. Why did you not say then that it did not accomplish anything for the agriculturists in this country? You admit by your very argument that you are making a horseplay with the agriculturists of America. Now, when you can not name the men who are to fill the offices under this appropriation, you are against the appropriation.

That is not an unusual attitude during these last two years. We stand in the matter of this appropriation as we have stood in a great many other things since we came into power two years ago, charged with extravagance, because we have inherited from an extravagant Republican administration mandates of law for the accomplishment of things.

Mr. BUTLER. But our extravagance will not justify your extravagance, will it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman's argument is that we must disregard the law that you placed upon the statute books; and, strange to say, you come in and repudiate the law which you passed, which requires this appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman recall that many of us, at the time of the passage of the act, regarded it as an experiment, and some of us questioned the feasibility of it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It was a very worthy experiment when the gentleman from Iowa thought a Republican administration could name the officials to conduct it, but it is, in his opinion, a very undesirable experiment now that a Democratic administration is in power.

Mr. STAFFORD. There were some on this side who disputed the feasibility of having the census taken.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I know a gentleman here and there did, but you on that side of the House can not escape the responsibility for this law. It was reported to this House by a Republican Census Committee. It was passed by a Republican House and a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think this is an unwise law?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the whole business of taking a census as it has been taken under Republican administrations had just as well not be taken, because they are so imperfect.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, if the gentleman wants my frank expression as to the advisability and the benefit that comes from it, I think that it will be very small indeed, because I agree with the gentleman from Iowa in the statement that he made—that this is not for the benefit of the American farmer. I think there is a benefit coming from it. I think there is a benefit from knowing how much wheat is to be grown, how much corn, how much cotton, how much live stock; but the class that will take advantage of this information is not the farmer, but the man who is speculating in products of the farmer.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman does not think it a wise law, it is not imperative to have it enforced.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I said in the beginning of my remarks that I favored the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may be permitted to continue for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I was not aware that I had any more time. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman remember how this provision got into the law?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I am frank to say that I do not.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman remember whether the House passed it originally or not?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I do not.

Mr. MANN. I thought I heard the gentleman say that the Republican Party and a Republican House passed it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I did say that, because both a Republican House and Senate were in existence.

Mr. MANN. That is neither here nor there. Does the gentleman remember what the facts were, whether a Republican House and a Republican Senate passed it?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think there was no roll call on it. The gentleman from Illinois will admit that his party was in power in both branches—the House and the Senate—and that that party must have taken the responsibility of the legislation. I do not think the gentleman can deny that at this time.

Mr. MANN. I assume that the party takes the responsibility for it, although you are largely engaged in shirking responsibility at this time.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that he never will find the gentleman from North Carolina now occupying the floor trying to shirk responsibility for action taken when his party is in control of the legislation.

Mr. MANN. Oh, very frequently you do that; but that is neither here nor there. I want to know whether the gentleman remembers whether the House ever had this provision under consideration.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It was passed through the House; how much it was discussed I do not remember.

Mr. MANN. Very often a man admits a thing which is not true. The Postmaster General has admitted before the Committee on Appropriations that he inserted the provision in the law. It is safe to make such an admission, because no one can disprove it, but it is not true.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly the gentleman does not deny, however this provision may have been put in the law, that it was passed in 1909, and he can not deny that in 1909 the Republican Party was in full control of both branches of Congress.

Mr. MANN. Of course I do not deny that, nor will I deny that it will be in full control in 1916. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman is going into the realms of prophecy. I think the gentleman has a much better memory for facts than he has ability for prophecy. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I think I have proved myself to be very good at prophecy so far.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman has not been very profuse with his prophecies lately.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some agreement to close debate, and I move that debate close on this paragraph in 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want some time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We have discussed this paragraph at some length now.

Mr. MANN. I think there can be no charge that the House has wasted time on this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. How much time do you want?

Mr. GOOD. I think that we ought to have at least 15 or 20 minutes on this side.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] and 15 by myself.

Mr. MANN. That amount of time does not include any for me. In view of the fact that I made the point of order and that every Democrat that has spoken so far has jumped upon me, can not I have some time? [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I also want 5 minutes, and I am opposed to the appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate be closed in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cox). The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 40 minutes, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] and 20 minutes by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if I should ask any Democrat before me this afternoon this question, "Do you believe that a business man who at the end of the year found that his income largely exceeded his expenditure was justified the next year in making expenditures that were desirable but not necessary?" each one would say "yes." If I followed it up by asking you if at the end of the year the business man had found his expenditures had largely exceeded his income, would he then be justified in making an expenditure the next year exceeding those of the last for objects that were desirable but not necessary, each one of you would say "no."

That is applying common business sense to business matters. But when it comes to applying that rule to the Government of the United States, every one of you—no; I am glad to say that is not so—but a majority of you refuse to apply these business principles to the Government of this country.

Why, you point to this law as a Republican law. Be that as it may, when that law was passed there was an overflowing Treasury, there was a surplus over expenditure, and we were justified then as you can not possibly justify yourselves today with the condition that your Treasury is in. Mr. Chairman, if the Republican Party was in power to-day and a Republican committee was preparing this bill, if the Treasury was in the condition which it now is—which it never would have been—there would have been no such appropriation as this reported in the bill.

On the contrary, not only would the appropriation not have been reported, but the appropriation for the census of manufactures would have been eliminated. There would have been economy practiced. The expenditures of the Government would be kept down within the income of the Government, because business principles would be applied. The responsibility is now upon you Democrats to apply those principles or take the consequences. Much has been said about the benefit to the farmer. Mr. Chairman, there is not a farmer whose production will be increased one bushel, whose price will be increased one penny, or whose cost of living will be reduced one nickel by the expenditure of this \$2,286,000. It can not be justified when you have on the statute books at the present time a war tax.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] was severely criticized because he referred to the fact that this would furnish a thousand jobs to Democrats. He put the number entirely too low. It will be nearer three thousand than one under the bill, but gentlemen on the Democratic side do not get the point of the criticism of the gentleman from Iowa. Gentlemen need not smile. There are 1,000 clerks which have been provided for in the provision which has just been stricken out, and in addition to those clerks there will be thousands of enumerators and special agents to appoint, and the gentleman from Iowa is trying to impress on the Democratic side of the House that if it were not for these proposed appointments which are to be received by Democratic Members of the House they would look upon this proposition impartially, upon its merits, where now they are more or less likely to be influenced by the fact that the passage of the amendment will carry patronage to them. You on that side, I say to you, can not afford by your vote on this question to do anything of this kind; and there will be a roll call upon it, you may rest assured, if it is agreed to now. You can not afford to get patronage by such

means, and I say that it will cost you much more than it will benefit you if you succeed now in putting it into the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have no applications for time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the arguments against this provision on the ground that it will furnish patronage to the Democratic Party are without merit. The paragraph does not contain the provision which the Republicans invariably inserted in such laws—that the appointments should be made without regard to the civil-service regulations. The only justification for the statement that the Democrats will receive all of the positions is the absolute conviction on the part of the Republicans in the House that the Democrats are so much better equipped that they would pass such superior examinations that they would be reached for certification in place of the Republicans.

But, Mr. Chairman, if it were true that the Democrats would get the places to be provided, it would be the only argument that would be persuasive enough to induce me to be in favor of the appropriation. I am opposed to making the appropriation, not because I believe it was unwise to pass the law when it was enacted, not because the information might not possibly be of some value to some person here or there throughout the country, but because I believe the condition of the Federal Treasury at this time does not justify appropriations for any activities of the Government unless they are imperatively demanded. In the Book of Estimates transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury on the opening day of this session the regular annual estimates for the fiscal year 1916 are stated in the sum of \$1,090,775,134.38. It would be a matter of gratification to this side of the House if that statement accurately and properly represented the estimates submitted to Congress at this time; but it does not. It is \$32,031,593 less than the estimates for the conduct of the Government during the fiscal year 1916 now actually before Congress.

The Post Office Department submitted estimates aggregating \$297,355,144. The Treasury Department states that the items, as computed by the Treasury Department, aggregate \$299,211,014. Those estimates were based on certain changes of law requested by the Postmaster General. The Post Office Committee has reported the Post Office bill, and it states in the report accompanying the bill that the estimates for the department, if submitted to Congress in proper sum, instead of aggregating \$297,355,144, are \$325,129,614, or an increase of \$27,774,000 over the sum stated in the Book of Estimates. In addition, there have been submitted since the first Monday in December certain supplemental estimates aggregating \$4,257,000, so that the total estimates of one billion ninety million and odd dollars are increased by \$32,031,000. These sums do not include an indefinite sum of about \$6,000,000 which must be appropriated for the construction of public buildings, for which no estimate has yet been submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Can I have a few minutes more?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that the gentleman can yield the time. There was no agreement that the time should be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes without regard to the agreement entered into respecting time.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman has already yielded him five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He has not the time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to continue for five minutes, without regard to the time fixed by the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report points out that the condition of the Treasury is such that it is unfortunate that the war-tax revenue act terminates on the 31st day of December, 1915. He expresses the belief that it should be extended in order to provide the necessary revenues to conduct the Government. With the condition that exists in Europe because of the widespread war, with our markets abroad completely demoralized, with the producers of foodstuffs and cotton and manufacturers throughout the length and breadth of the land unable to find markets for their products, and compelled for that reason to permit labor to remain idle, with increasing difficulties everywhere encountered to finance their operations, it seems to me that it is an imperative duty of this Congress to refrain from appropriations for any activity of the Government or for any service of the Government unless it be absolutely essential. Only those things that are imperatively required for the conduct of the Government should receive any consideration at the hands of the Congress. Where are the public funds to be obtained to finance all of the operations suggested? Of how much real value to the farming interests of the country will be the information proposed to be obtained. The census which was taken in 1910 of the very products of which it is proposed to take a census now was not available completely until 1914.

The first bulletin was published in 1912 and complete reports in 1914. Those who urged that this census be taken at this time, based the need upon the ground that it was necessary to have accurate information taken through the census upon which the estimates of the Agricultural Department might be founded so as to revise out any error; yet, if the information can not be available inside of two years at the best, of what particular advantage is it. How advantageous is it to the farmers of the country at this time to know whether the wheat crop is to be between two or three million bushels of the estimate of the Department of Agriculture? The raisers of foodstuffs and of cotton and the manufacturers of the country are not so particularly interested in knowing how many bales or how many bushels or how many tons of material are to be produced as they are in the obtaining of markets where their products can be sold and some return obtained for their labor. I believe it to be a grave mistake, Mr. Chairman, to propose to expend at this time public funds upon activities of the Government, highly desirable, if you please, when the Treasury is in a condition to permit it, beneficial in many respects when we are able to do the work without imposing a great burden upon the people, but absolutely indefensible when the people are suffering under the burden of an irksome, detestable, and unpopular war-revenue law. [Applause on the Republican side.] There does not seem, in my opinion, to be any prospect of the clearing of the situation in Europe which will result in the very near future in largely increasing imports into this country. Unless we are to have an increase in our imports our customs receipts necessarily will not reach the level anticipated when the customs law was enacted. The revenues must be supplemented in other ways, such as from the war-revenue law. At the next session of the Congress, in all probability, we will be called upon either to extend the war-revenue act for another year or else devise some other method of obtaining the moneys necessary to conduct the Government. In all sincerity let me urge my Democratic colleagues to make the difficulties as light as possible. Do not increase the burdens to be faced in the next campaign. We must economize. Here is an opportunity to do so. We should not miss it. We will regret our failures quickly unless we appreciate what the country demands and resolutely meet the situation. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I will leave to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to state particularly how this section got into the bill, as I think he will. I want to call the attention of gentlemen, however, to the very patent fact that it could not have been well considered. Let me call the attention of gentlemen to the first section of the act of 1909, which provides that a census of the population, agriculture, manufacturing, and mines, and so forth, of the United States shall be taken by the Director of the Census in the year 1910 and every 10 years thereafter. I want gentlemen particularly to note that it provides in the very first section of the bill that a census of agriculture shall be taken in the year 1910. Now turn to section 31 of the bill, one of the very last sections of the bill, and it is provided that there shall be in the year 1915 and once every 10 years thereafter a census of agriculture, live stock, and so forth. Now, there could have been only one of two grounds or reasons for

the provision of taking a census of agriculture—one decennially or every decennial period and the other every five years thereafter—so it must have been thought necessary to take a census every five years, or it must have been thought best to take an agricultural census not then but in five years thereafter. Now, however, we have this condition: The most complete, the most elaborate—in fact, the most complete and elaborate—census of agriculture that was ever taken by any country in the world was taken in the year 1910 and thereafter, and we have had only now within a year's time the result of that, so that we have now here before us the result of the census that was taken in the year 1910. But now again we are asked to take a census in the year 1915. I submit to gentlemen on the other side that in the condition of the Treasury there is certainly no possible justification for doing such a thing as that, and the question has not been met that was suggested by my friend and colleague from Iowa [Mr. Goob], that now there is being taken every year by the Department of Agriculture a census every whit as complete as is demanded by the terms of this act, and which is given to the people fresh every year.

So that the necessity for the things that are suggested is not only not apparent but it is absolutely shown to be entirely unnecessary. It is suggested that these reports are made and estimates are made upon the basis of the census of 1910. Only to a very limited extent is that true, I will say to the gentleman, because the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture are now made from reports that are taken both by the States and by the Nation that are transmitted to him; that they are the result of specific inquiries directed to farmers themselves with regard to the amount of acreage in crops and the amount of production for that particular year. So that we have exactly the same information now, derived every year, that could be obtained from a census of agriculture, because the enumerators will have to go to these farmers and will have to have from them these reports just as they are now being reported, not only to the United States Agricultural Department directly but also to the State departments of agriculture. So it is absolutely useless that we should make this expenditure at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am very positive in saying, and very glad to say, that I do not agree with my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], that the American people are paying 1 cent more public taxes under Democratic administration than they paid under Republican administrations. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There has been a loss of taxes paid on imports, it is true. We Democrats believe that we have demonstrated to the American people that tariff taxes are the most burdensome and expensive taxes that any people can pay. They have been supplanted in part by direct taxes, which reveal exactly how much they produce to the Treasury. No part of it is going indirectly into the pockets of any favored class in this country, as is the case with tariff. I do not agree that there is any unusual burden on the American people at this time.

And I want to clear up another situation here which seems to have caused some debate in this House, and that is, that this proposition is permeated with spoils. Why, my colleague from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has pointed out that these thousand clerks must be appointed, unless specially exempt, under the civil-service system. All this talk about spoils is entirely a false issue raised in this case.

Now, the question is as to what is the need of an agricultural census at this time. We had before us the gentleman who claimed to be the author of this provision. He said he had the collaboration of the Republican chairman of the Census Committee, the former Member from Indiana, Mr. Crumpacker. He said further:

Prior to the final bill introduced by Mr. Crumpacker, of Indiana, providing for the Thirteenth Census, I had made an effort to secure a quinquennial census of the acreage in the United States, planted to the principal crops, and of the number of domestic animals and their value. I had attempted to enumerate those crops. The original bill provided for the acreage planted to corn, wheat, oats, cotton, tobacco, and hay. After some discussion, Mr. Crumpacker finally suggested that potatoes were a valuable crop, one of the principal crops, and should be included. We eliminated all designations, and used the expression "the principal crops grown in the United States."

Thus it appears this proposition was accepted by the Republican committee with full knowledge that it called for an agricultural census in 1915.

Now, the claim has been made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] that no farmer can benefit by this census, and that the only person liable to benefit by it is the speculator.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In just a minute. I want to first preface that, but I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute. He based his proposition upon the result of the census of 1910, which was the most unsatisfactory and expensive census the American people have ever had taken. It is true that a large amount of the material then gathered was not available for the farmer or anybody else, and never will be. It is true that the statements submitted to the farmers at that time contained 102 questions on one sheet, and could not be answered by a farmer unless he kept a double entry set of books. This is a very simple census, confined to three propositions, and there is no reason on earth why it can not be gotten out in a reasonable time after it is collected.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to say that the gentleman is partially incorrect as to what I stated. I made no allusion to speculators. As a matter of fact, it will not be a benefit to them. I did not make my statement strong enough, because I should have added another year to the time that will intervene.

Mr. BORLAND. That will make the gentleman just that much further wrong.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. These crops will be the crops of 1914.

Mr. BORLAND. Now, let us see. I will read:

Mr. BORLAND. * * * I was going to ask this further question: Do not the local officials attempt to compile some statistics like that? Mr. BURLESON. They are mere estimates. The purpose of this is to get away from estimates and to get an actual enumeration, so as to have a more definite basis of comparison. When it is a mere estimate they start in one year with a knowledge of the actual number of acres planted to cotton, and the next year it is a guess or an estimate, and the next year, of course, certain elements of chance enter into it, and they result in error, and the next year these are carried forward and the error becomes greater, until the last year before the decennial period arrives it is, I will not say of no value, but it is of very much less value than it was the first and second years, whereas if we could have a standard every five years it would be very much more valuable to the agriculturists of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, whether the party now in the minority is responsible for or is to be credited with this piece of legislation is immaterial. I think the man who claims credit for its enactment recognized then an existing state of facts. We of the minority are compelled to recognize now a different state of facts. There had been at that time passed, or was all ready for passage, a tariff law which protected nearly every agricultural product in the United States; so that the amount of farm products raised in this country was expected to have a definite relation to the 90,000,000 consumers we had at that time. In other words, the American producer was to have control of the home market. The farmer, seeing consumption and production rapidly approximating each other, could know the large source of demand, and a census would aid him in estimating the sources of supply.

Since that time, however, there has been enacted by the present majority of this House a new and entirely different tariff law. That law places upon the free list, or practically upon the free list, nearly all our agricultural products, including crops and live stock, which the farmers would be interested in knowing about and which a census might reveal. In the latter state of affairs the farmers of this country are interested in knowing not so much the statement of crops and live stock in this country as they are the crops and live stock of the countries which compete with us at this time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So, with the multiplied millions of farm products, including crops and live stock, that are coming into this country free, the farmer has not the interest in knowing these facts that he would otherwise have, because he has lost control of the American market. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If you want to do something for the farmers laboring under the burdens and disadvantages of the present tariff law in order to give them some information upon which to base their estimates as to how much they ought to seed of grain or other crops and what live stock to raise and what not to raise, you ought to take an agricultural census of the world, including Argentina and Canada, Mexico and Australia. Then you would give them information of value. As it is now, with the hundreds of millions of increased crops and live stock annually shipped into this country, this information would be of little value to the farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is really amusing to us on this side who remember how gentlemen on the other side enthusiastically supported this proposition in 1909, when they were in control of the House. This was a good proposition then. But whenever you break the tie that binds a Republican to the power of patronage you break his heart. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Republicans flourish in rank luxuriance when holding on to the public pap. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Sever his connection with patronage and he is hard to enthuse on anything that will help the farmers of the country. Now you have the opportunity to help the American farmer, but you refuse to do so. You talk economy when it comes to expending money in the interest of the farmers of America. You were in control of the Government for 16 years, and you made appropriations for Army and Navy purposes.

We have not been in control of the Government quite two years, and yet you are telling us that the Army and the Navy are not in condition to fight a foreign foe if we should become involved in a foreign war. What has become of all the preparations growing out of the vast sums of money appropriated for that purpose during all those years? I suggest that a grand jury should inquire into the appropriations made by the Republicans for Army and Navy purposes during the 16 years in which they were in power. Gentlemen on that side are so anxious to play party politics that they are driven to the miserable extreme of misrepresenting their country's preparedness for war. I did not believe, Mr. Chairman, that in their efforts to oppose Democratic legislation that they would oppose this measure in the interest of the agricultural classes of this country. I am utterly surprised at my friends from the West, Republicans over there, standing up here and preaching economy when we are trying to gather information that will be of benefit to the humblest farmer in this country. Oh, we can spend millions of money to carry the mails across the ocean; we can spend more than \$50,000,000 to carry mails on railroad trains; but an appropriation designed to benefit millions of farming people in this country—your oppose it and excuse yourself on the ground of economy.

And one gentleman on that side suggests that Democrats will be appointed to fill these places. I told you at the outset that the question of patronage was always uppermost in the mind of the Republicans. You take a Republican away from the pie counter and he is in an awful fix. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Your only reason for opposing this provision is that you fear that Democrats would fill these places. Let me warn you, gentlemen, when some fellow gets you properly arraigned before your constituents and asks you about your conduct this afternoon, when we are fighting here for a proposition to gather statistics that will be of benefit to this great class—the most-imposed-upon class of people in this country or in any other country in the world, the farming class—he will ask you why you favored getting up statistics for manufacturers, and why you smiled when that was done, and when we ask that some money be expended in the interest of the toiling masses of this country you pleaded economy as an excuse for your failure to aid the farmer. Quit this miserable political play, gentlemen, and join us and help us to secure this much-needed legislation for the farmers of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have one more speech on this side. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, after all, there ought not to be any politics in a matter of this sort. This provision in the law was passed in the law of 1909. It was in the bill as introduced in the House. It was not referred to in debate. I do not think anybody in the House, practically, knew it was here. That bill was the result of a veto by President Roosevelt of a bill passed in the prior Congress. The bill as passed was passed at the special session at which the tariff law was enacted. In the previous Congress this paragraph was not referred to in debate in any way whatever.

Gentlemen who are familiar with the Census Office will recall the fact that in 1902 we had provided for a permanent Census Bureau, with very little to do. The Census Bureau had to find something to give an excuse for its continued existence. They largely prepared the bill which President Roosevelt vetoed at the end of the Sixtieth Congress and which, slightly modified, was passed in the Sixty-first Congress.

It is all right for the minority at any time to charge the majority with responsibility for legislation, but there was no

party division on that bill at any time. The Census Office was constantly and continuously claiming that if they were given this extra work to do between the decennial censuses they could do it with a very slight increase in their force; that they would be busy on the decennial census until toward the end of the five-year period, and then when the five-year period came they could take the manufactures census and the agricultural census with almost no additional expense. Well, I did not believe it then, and I am convinced now that it is not correct, because here is a proposition which comes from the Census Bureau, properly made to the House under the law, in which they propose to appropriate money for a force necessary to take a new census almost as though there was no permanent Census Office in existence.

Now, everyone will admit that if an agricultural census were necessary every 10 years, or every 5 years, or every year, the Government ought to make it. Agriculture is the great field of activity of more of our people than any other. But, as a matter of fact, the 10-year agricultural census—and that is the only one we have ever made—has worked well in the past; and with the work of the Agricultural Department, making its estimates of crops, we are quite convinced in the present, as in the past, that we know from year to year practically all of the statistics about agriculture. I remember when the agricultural census was made in 1900 and again in 1910. An agricultural census made by enumerators is a guess. There is not one farmer in ten who can tell how many bushels of corn he grows, if he grows much corn. It is a guess. Well, we take the guesses because they are all we can take; but the Agricultural Department, with its experts, having the figures of the Census Office one year, can estimate with an accuracy almost equal to that of the Census Office the amount of farm land cultivated the next year. We have the statistics practically accurate. Now, is there occasion at this time to take this agricultural census? In my judgment the people of Chicago get more benefit from the agricultural census than the people of any other district in the United States. My colleague [Mr. MADDEN] and myself probably have more members of the Chicago Board of Trade living in our districts than live in all the rest of Chicago. It is there where the men work over statistics, and if I thought the agricultural statistics would be of value to the farmer I would know that they would be of more value to the board of trade operators. But they will get along without them. We have got to cut expenses somewhere. We can not keep on making appropriations. Every time the question arises we may say, "Oh, well; we will make this appropriation and save some other time"; but the only time when the Lord lets a man save is at the time when the opportunity is presented. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, during Mr. Roosevelt's administration the Republican Party passed a law providing for the taking of the decennial census. It provided for the appointment of the employees by the spoils system. President Roosevelt vetoed that bill. You waited until another President came in, and then you passed the census bill under which the decennial census was taken, and you provided for a noncompetitive examination, which was the old spoils system.

Now our friends are talking about economy. The farmer from Chicago [Mr. MANN], leading you men from the West, talks about cutting down expenditures when it comes to taking a census for the American farmer. When you came into power in 1897 this legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill carried \$21,000,000. When you went out of power, after 16 years, you had increased it to \$38,000,000. And what is true with respect to the legislative bill is true with respect to all the other appropriation bills. Here at the last session of Congress, in every case when a motion was made to increase the amount proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, you could always count on practically a solid vote on that side of the House to overrule the committee. Yet in the fall of the year you went out to the country and criticized the aggregate of the appropriations. And so it is here. It is not economy that our friends are concerned about.

When you were in power you provided for this census. You supposed that your people were to take it. There was no talk of economy then; but now, when somebody else is in power, when somebody else is to appoint the men who are to take the census, you have a spasm of economy. Gentlemen from the great agricultural States of the Middle West are following the farmer from Chicago. Of course, the gentleman from Illinois—the distinguished leader on that side—knows nothing about farming. He lives in an atmosphere where farming and farmers do not flourish. But surely the Representatives of the true farmers of the country are not going to deny to the people an agricultural census.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I have not time. I gave you people 30 minutes and took only 20 minutes myself.

Mr. COOPER. I merely wanted to ask you a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The census of 1910 cost \$15,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 was spent in gathering agricultural statistics. A Democratic Census Director proposes to take the agricultural census for the people for \$2,286,000, or a little more than half what the Republicans spent in taking the agricultural census in 1910.

We propose to take a census that will be worth something to the people. The census of 1910 was so complicated and scientific as to be absolutely worthless. We propose to go to the country with a few simple, direct questions and get the information and print it in available form, quickly, for the benefit of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], and then the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee:

Page 119, after line 11, insert the following:

"Census of agriculture: For taking, compiling, and completing the census of agriculture required by section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, providing for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses, \$2,286,100."

Substitute offered by Mr. GOOD:

Page 119, at the end of line 11, insert:

"That section 31 of the act approved July 2, 1909, is hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Good) there were 57 ayes and 60 noes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. Good and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 72 ayes and 59 noes.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For completion of investigations incident to the establishment of units and standards of refrigeration, and the determination of the physical constants of materials used in the refrigeration industries, such as ammonia, aqueous ammonia solutions, carbonic acid, brines, etc., and the determination of the thermal conductivities of materials, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$15,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 130, line 21, after the word "for," strike out the words "completion of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "continuing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioners of conciliation: To enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 8 of the act creating the Department of Labor, and to appoint commissioners of conciliation, for per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4 pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, and traveling expenses, including an executive clerk at \$2,000 in the District of Columbia, \$50,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 135, line 9, after the word "Columbia," strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$75,000."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the most important work of the Labor Department is that of conciliation and mediation or adjusting labor troubles. The report shows that they have prevented about 30 different labor disputes between employer and employee in the industrial world, meaning a saving of probably millions of dollars to the people. This work is something that may in times past have been considered as in the experimental stage, but this is no longer so. It has been proven that it can be of great service, and due to that fact, in my opinion, there will be a much greater demand for services in that line in the next fiscal year than there has been in the past.

Therefore, in my opinion, it is important to appropriate this money which the Secretary asks for in his estimate. For fear that some one might misunderstand me again, I want to assure

gentlemen that this effort to increase this appropriation has not been suggested to me by the Secretary of Labor or by anyone in that office. My information, as far as that is concerned, is that the Secretary is willing to submit to the position of the committee on it, and so far as I know has not asked anyone to make any effort in that direction.

I am offering the amendment because I know the great importance of the work. I have had a wide experience in the industrial world, and I know the cost of industrial wars. I know that anything the Government can do to prevent industrial wars is of great importance and benefit to all of our people, because industrial wars affect more than those immediately concerned in them; they affect business throughout the whole country whenever they occur.

The Secretary reports that there have been 30 settlements made satisfactorily to employers and employees, and very few failures. There is no doubt that there has been some good work in every effort that has been made along that line. I think that no Member of this House ought to withhold his consent to giving \$75,000, so that if it is necessary it may be used either on the work of conciliation and mediation or, if necessary, in arbitration, so that the work may not be obstructed by lack of funds.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, just a word. Last year we appropriated for this purpose \$25,000. For the current year we have doubled the amount, giving \$50,000. There is nothing in the testimony that leads the committee to believe that \$50,000 is not ample, and a like amount for the next year would be ample.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois) there were 20 ayes and 44 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the items stricken from the bill on a point of order, as indicated in the written memorandum I have sent to the desk, be restored to the bill. That will restore all of the items in the bill except the language to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] made the point of order. I ask that the memorandum be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the paragraph, on pages 93 and 94, covering the Indian Office, be restored, omitting therefrom the words "second assistant commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of"; also restore to the bill paragraph, pages 96 and 97, covering the Patent Office; paragraph, page 98, covering the Bureau of Education; paragraph, pages 104, 105, and 106, covering the Postmaster General's Office; paragraph, pages 108 and 109, covering the Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the items just read by the Clerk be considered as not having been stricken out of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19909, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, 11 o'clock is a very inconvenient hour for Members to come here to answer to a roll call. We have had several 11 o'clock meetings this week, and a good many Members have expressed a desire for an opportunity to be in their offices.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The reason for making the request was that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, very kindly consented that this bill should take precedence over the Post Office appropriation bill, and he desired

that we should get through with this bill so that he could take up his at 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. It will not take long to-morrow. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], in the nature of a substitute, repealing the law of 1909 providing for an agricultural census.

Mr. ADAMSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw an objection which I interposed yesterday to a request made by my amiable friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] trying to effect an exchange of days. I objected—something that I have not done in 18 years—and I desire to leave the bright escutcheon unmarred by any such conduct. I therefore desire to withdraw the objection.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that request has passed into ancient history.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWN of New York, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for five days, on account of the death of the wife of his business partner.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 18, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the president of the Board of Commissioners of the United States Soldiers' Home upon the financial and other affairs of the military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., together with copies of reports from the commanding officer of that prison and the commanding officer of the Pacific branch, United States military prison, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1418); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers United States Army, report upon a preliminary examination, plan, and estimate of cost of improvement of Fivemile River Harbor, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 1419); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication of the Librarian of Congress submitting a proposed provision of law which he desires to have included in the urgent deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 1420); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chairman of the Commission on Industrial Relations, transmitting its first annual report; to the Committee on Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20095) to establish the Legislative Reference Division of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 20096) providing for a site and public building for a post office at Thomson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 20097) to extend the time for the completion of dams across the Savannah River by authority granted to Twin City Power Co. by an act approved February 29, 1908, as amended by act approved June 3, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 20098) directing the Secretary of War to make preliminary survey of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20099) for the allotment of lands to certain enrolled Yankton Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 20100) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a memorial bridge to the memory of William Penn, and for the construction thereof, with the approaches thereto; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 20101) to acquire a site for a public building at the village of Thompsonville, town of Enfield, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 20102) to provide for a low rate of interest and long-time loans in aid of agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THACHER: A bill (H. R. 20103) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station between Cahoons Hollow and Nauset Stations on Cape Cod, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 20104) to acquire a site for a public building at Southington, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 20105) to provide for further construction and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 20106) to provide for a substitute list of storekeeper-gaugers in the Internal-Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 388) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause investigation to be made concerning duplicate and fraudulent enrollments and allotments in the Creek Nation, and to enforce the rights of said Creek Nation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 389) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 390) creating a commission and authorizing said commission to acquire by purchase the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson and the park surrounding the same, consisting of 700 acres of land, all of said property being located in Albemarle County, Va.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORE: Resolution (H. Res. 680) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to George Curtis Peck, clerk of the late Hon. Sereno E. Payne, the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Resolution (H. Res. 681) authorizing the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish all articles and make all necessary repairs relating to the House barber shop; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 20108) granting a pension to Oscar F. Lutz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20109) granting an increase of pension to Christian Leser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20110) granting an increase of pension to Louise Hartung; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20111) granting an increase of pension to Katharina Sudbrock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 20112) granting an increase of pension to Robert Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20113) granting a pension to Ellen Flood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20114) for the relief of the family of Thomas J. McCarty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 20115) granting an increase of pension to John A. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 20116) for the relief of J. E. and A. L. Penneck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 20117) granting an increase of pension to Mary Quinlan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 20118) granting a pension to Friederike Potter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 20119) for the relief of the Citizens Loan & Building Co., Lima, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 20120) granting a pension to Albert G. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 20121) granting an increase of pension to Laura R. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20122) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 20123) granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Ashby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 20124) for the relief of Francis E. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 20125) granting a pension to Thomas G. Cockings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20126) for the relief of Kate Chateau; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 20127) granting an increase of pension to D. D. Downs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 20128) granting a pension to Daisy E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 20129) for the relief of the Yakima Savings & Loan Association, of North Yakima, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20130) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Cope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 20131) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. Brown, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 20132) granting a pension to Ida Wingart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20133) granting an increase of pension to John R. Perrine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 20134) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 20135) granting an increase of pension to George S. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 20136) granting an increase of pension to David Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 20137) for the relief of Warren Gilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 20138) granting an increase of pension to John F. Ransom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20139) granting an increase of pension to Mary Speck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 20140) granting an increase of pension to John A. Medley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 20141) granting a pension to Leila O. Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20142) granting an increase of pension to William B. Batman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 20143) granting an increase of pension to John A. Brindle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 20144) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 20145) granting an increase of pension to John Goldsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 20146) granting an increase of pension to Edmund N. Hatcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAKES: Petition of 15 citizens of Fairfield and 19 citizens of Sand Creek, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of commercial interests of Chicago, Ill., requesting all nations to enter into an agreement with the United States Government to make the high seas and oceans international neutral highways under the control of an international naval board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of American Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Mott Haven Reformed Church, of New York City, favoring passage of Senate joint resolution 154, relative to marriage and divorce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Order of Railway Conductors, Railroad Trainmen, etc., favoring passage of House bill 17894—Goetze bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Western Association of Short Line Railroads, protesting against the passage of House bill 17042, changing basis of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Main, of New York City, favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Francis Bayers, of New York City, N. Y., favoring bill to prohibit shipment of war material to fighting nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Henry Spreigelberger, of New York City, relative to salaries of the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of commission on relations with Japan, appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring an adequate oriental policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of churches, Sunday schools, etc., in Albion, Arcade, Attica, Barnard, Brockport, Clarkson, Dale, Mount Morris, Perry, Rochester, Wyoming, and York, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of Synod of Minnesota, Presbyterian Church in the United States, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Memorial of the First Reformed Church of Passaic, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Epworth League of the Park Methodist Episcopal Church, of Weehawken, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Trades and Labor Council of La Crosse, Wis., favoring neutrality by United States Government in European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the commission on relations with Japan appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring an adequate oriental policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Pawtuxet Baptist Church, Edgewood, R. I.; E. C. Bullard, People's Church, Auburn, R. I.; Lucius L. Belden, Natick, R. I.; Rev. G. W. Manning, Phenix, R. I.; Trinity Baptist Church, Olneyville, R. I.; H. H. Whaley, Wakefield, R. I.; Centerville Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Centerville, R. I.; Baptist Church and Christian Endeavor Society, North Scituate, R. I.; 20 residents of Johnston, R. I.; 4 residents of Providence, R. I.; H. Tobey Smith, Providence, R. I.; H. M. Clarke, Arctic, R. I.; and Wayland M. Burgess, Jacob Worth, James M. Ford, Frank F. Brown, D. H. Remington, Mrs. Charles Hubbard, Sadie P. Potter, Marjorie H. Barstow, Della M. Hopkins, Susan J. Hopkins, Mrs. Frank Thornton, Miss Ethel Sprague, Miss Flora Birkholz, Miss Alice E. Arndt, Miss Ruth Boss, Miss Etta L. Hopkins, Miss Grace M. Johnson, Miss Anna E. Sayles, Miss Mary A. Austin, Miss Jennie I. Spencer, Mrs. Mabel Smith, Mrs. Mabel Lowell, Miss Sadie Spaulding, J. C. Worden, Jr., John E. Lyons, Miss Addie E. Taft, Mrs. G. J. Eddy, Alice P. Thornton, Miss Mary E. Durfee, Miss Susie E. Durfee, Miss Helen M. Durfee, Miss Marion A. Atwood, Miss Emogene P. Lyon, Miss M. L. Steere, Miss H. J. Swain, Miss M. A. Swain, Miss M. L. Clough, Rev. Charles Parker, Mrs. A. W. Burgess, Mrs. John Randall, Everett R. Spencer, Miss Helen M. Hopkins, and Miss Viola M. Wilson, of North Scituate, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Jones, Mundy & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Western Association of Short Line Railroads, protesting against passage of House bill 17042 and Senate bill 6406; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Howard Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House joint resolution to create national marketing commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions favoring national prohibition from Embury Methodist Episcopal Church, Central Falls; Rev. Matthias S. Kaufman, Central Falls; St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence; H. Tobey Smith, Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Petition of Knights of Columbus of Mount Angel, Oreg., protesting against alleged outrages in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petitions of sundry citizens of the third congressional district of Connecticut, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of First Congregational Church of Falmouth, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of J. A. Ricks and other citizens of Headrick, Jackson County, Okla., favoring Government aid for cotton market; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Catholic Knights of America, Branch No. 825, of Oklahoma City, Okla., against circulation through the mails of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIS: Memorial of Ohio Building Association, protesting against passage of the emergency revenue act and offering amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Baptist Young People's Union and Baptist Church of Sunbury, Ohio; Methodist Protestant Church and Evangelical Church of Mount Cory; and business committee of the Ohio Sunday School Association, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 18, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, Almighty God, that with the pressing cares that bind our thoughts so closely to the temporal Thou hast still kept alive within us the grasp of the spiritual. By the slow processes of our human investigation Thou art unfolding to us the uses and purposes of the life about us; Thou art also giving to us that divine impulse which reaches out after the immortal, the never ending, the eternal. And so our friendships never die, every duty takes on an eternal significance, and life presses on the upward path, the path of the righteous that shines more and more unto the perfect day. Let the grace of God lead us in this path this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1914, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

COMMISSION ON RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following communication, which will be read.

The communication was read and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

[Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, national office, 612 United Charities Building, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York.]

AN APPEAL TO CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES FOR AN ADEQUATE ORIENTAL POLICY.

The awakening of Asia and her rapid acquisition of imported elements of occidental civilization inaugurates a new era in world history in which Asia is to play a new and increasingly important rôle. Whether that rôle shall be one of peace, good will, and mutual cooperation or one controlled by increasing suspicion and fear between the East and the West will depend largely on the attitude of the western nations themselves.

It has seemed to many of our citizens who have become familiar with the questions raised by this more intimate and ever-increasing contact with the Orient that the United States might well adopt a more adequate oriental policy. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Commission on Relations with Japan, appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America upon Congress and upon the people of the United States the importance of adopting an oriental policy based upon a just and equitable regard for the interests of all the nations concerned, and to this end suggests that the entire immigration problem be taken up at an early date, providing for comprehensive legislation covering all phases of the question (such as the limitation of immigration and the registration, distribution, employment, education, and naturalization of immigrants) in such a way as to conserve American institutions, to protect American labor from dangerous economic competition, and to promote an intelligent and enduring friendliness among the people of all nations.

Charles R. Brown; Hamilton Holt; William I. Haven; Charles R. Henderson; E. R. Hendrix; Jeremiah W. Jenks; Albert G. Lawson; Frederick Lynch; Francis J. McConnell; John R. Mott; Frank Mason North; Doremus Scudder; Robert E. Speer; George E. Vincent; Amos P. Wilder; Sidney L. Gulick, representative on international relations; Charles S. Macfarland, secretary Commission on Relations with Japan, appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

DECEMBER 18, 1914.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oakdale and Wilmette, in the State of Illinois; of Tarkio, Mo.; of Sacramento, Cal.; of Springdale, Pa.; of Viola, Kans.; and of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newton, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Downs and Lawrence, Kans., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ellis, Neta-waka, Redfield, Russell, Ozawkie, Abbyville, Olathe, Luray, Glen Elder, Lyons, and Hutchinson, and of Edwards and Pawnee Counties, all in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TILLMAN presented petitions of the Comrade Adult Bible Class, the Wesley Adult Bible Class, and the Baraca Adult Bible Class of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist Sunday Schools, all of Conway, in the State of South Carolina, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of Bay City, Mich., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chugwater, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LIPPITT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Johnston, R. I., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the Mercantile Club, of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of the Builders' Exchange of Cleveland and of the Retail Merchants' Association of Bellefontaine, in the State of Ohio, praying for the creation of a national security commission, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Lawrenceburg, Indianapolis, and Elkhart, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national recognition of the polar efforts of Dr. Frederick A. Cook, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented petitions of the Ministerial Association of Lebanon; of the Friends' Church of Carmel; of the New Hope Friends' Church, of Greentown; of the Friends' Church of Elizabethtown; of the Eaglecreek Friends' Church, of Westfield; of the Mentone Baptist Church, of Mentone; of the Church of Christ of Gas City; of the Hillside Christian Church, of Indianapolis; of the Friends' Church of Sheridan; of the Church of God of Syracuse; of the United Brethren and Methodist Episcopal Churches of Hudson; of the Hinkles Creek Friends' Church, of Cicero; of the New Albany Ministerial Association, of New Albany; of the Christian Church of Hammond; of the churches of Clarksburg, Kingston, and Sandusky; of the Methodist, Baptist, and Christian Churches of Gas City; of Mrs. Olive Smith, of Dunkirk; of Clayton L. Rhode and 10 other citizens of Wellsboro; and of the superintendent of the Union Street Friends' Bible School and Church, of Kokomo, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Waynesboro and of the Board of Trade of Oakland, Pittsburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the creation of a national security commission, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the State Council of Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and of the National Council, Daughters of Liberty, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.